

thise with his wife and family in the great loss they have sustained.

Question put and passed.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 4:47 o'clock, until the next day.

## Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 8th September, 1903.

[ALL-NIGHT SITTING.]

	PAGE
Questions: Metropolitan Waterworks, validity of by-laws	841
Tick in West Kimberley, to inquire	841
Midland Junction Workshops, Plant	841
Hospital at Broome, Cost	842
State Forestry, to legislate	842
Financial Statement, when	842
Bill: Redistribution of Seats, Select Committee's recommendations considered in Committee of the whole House, clauses passed, First Schedule discussed at length, Divisions (9), Progress reported after all-night sitting	842

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at 4:30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

#### PAPER PRESENTED.

By the PREMIER: Rules and regulations in relation to payment of Supreme Court fees by means of adhesive stamps.

Ordered, to lie on the table.

#### QUESTION—METROPOLITAN WATERWORKS, VALIDITY OF BY-LAWS.

MR. OATS asked the Premier: 1, Whether his attention has been drawn to an article in the *Sunday Press* newspaper of the 30th August, in which it is contended that certain by-laws of the Metropolitan Waterworks Board are *ultra vires*. 2, Whether it is true that a considerable portion of the board's revenue is obtained under the by-laws alleged to be illegal. 3, Whether the Government

will make inquiries, and if necessary introduce a Bill this session, to remedy the board's defective position.

THE PREMIER replied: 1, No. 2 and 3, Inquiries will be made, as the hon. member desires such action; but otherwise no importance will be attached to the matter.

#### QUESTION—TICK IN WEST KIMBERLEY, TO INQUIRE.

MR. WALLACE asked the Minister for Lands: Whether, in consequence of a remark made in this House yesterday to the effect that cattle tick is existent in West Kimberley, the Government will make inquiries for the purpose of ascertaining whether or not such statement is correct, and, if correct, whether the necessary steps will be taken to deal with the stock coming from that district.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: Similar statements were made relative to West Kimberley in 1896, when tick first appeared in East Kimberley, but an inspection showed that the herds of the former district were clean. Since then the clean condition of West Kimberley has not been questioned until now. Thousands of West Kimberley cattle are shipped South to Fremantle every year. They are closely inspected, but no sign of tick life has ever been discovered; their hides are free from the puncture marks which betray the presence of tick. Cattle arriving from West Kimberley, despite the careful inspection to which they are subjected, have never given the officers of the Stock Division the slightest cause to suspect the presence of tick in that district.

#### QUESTION—MIDLAND JUNCTION WORKSHOPS, PLANT.

MR. TAYLOR asked the Minister for Works: 1, Whether the Government have been informed from any source that the ship "Milton Park" has been lost at sea. 2, If so, what steps the Government have taken to replace the plant which she had on board for the new Workshops at Midland Junction. 3, Whether, in view of the time which must elapse before the arrival of the plant to be again ordered, the Government will consider the advisability of placing the orders locally as far as may be practicable.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, The "Milton Park" is overdue, but so far as Government can ascertain has not yet been posted at "Lloyd's" as missing. 2, The Government has cabled the Agent General to at once repeat the order directly the vessel is reported as missing, should that occur. 3, The plant, etc., is of such a nature that placing orders locally would be impracticable, and only lead to more delay.

#### QUESTION—HOSPITAL AT BROOME, COST.

MR. PIGOTT asked the Premier: What was the cost to the State of the hospital at Broome for the twelve months ending 30th June last.

THE PREMIER replied: The cost of Broome hospital during the last financial year was £907 15s. 2d. 104 patients were treated, and £218 16s. received as fees.

#### QUESTION—STATE FORESTRY, TO LEGISLATE.

MR. HIGHAM (for Mr. Diamond) asked the Premier: Whether it is the intention of the Government during this session of Parliament to introduce any legislation for the development and better protection of our forests.

THE PREMIER replied: Nothing was at present contemplated until the Forest Commission had finally reported.

#### QUESTION—FINANCIAL STATEMENT, WHEN.

MR. MORAN: I would like to ask the Premier, in the absence of the Treasurer, when we may expect the Budget, or whether we are to get it at all this session? [A pause.] Am I entitled to an answer, Mr. Speaker?

THE SPEAKER: A Minister is not obliged to answer a question put in that way.

THE PREMIER: There are certain ways of putting questions, and certain other ways.

MR. MORAN: There are certain ways of not answering them.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. member had better give notice.

MR. MORAN: All right. I give notice for to-morrow.

#### REDISTRIBUTION OF SEATS BILL. IN COMMITTEE.

Bill as amended *pro forma* now considered in detail.

MR. HARPER in the Chair; the PREMIER in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Electoral Provinces:

MR. MORAN: Before going into the question of redistribution, there was an important motion pending in regard to the Constitution Bill which had for its object a desire to reconsider in Committee whether there were to be 27 or 21 members for the Upper Chamber, and whether there were to be 50 or 42 members for the Lower Chamber. That motion was entitled to precedence. We should not presume, at least he did not, that the motion would not be carried. There was any amount of precedent for reconsidering Bills on their third reading. This was done frequently, and important alterations were made last session on the third reading of Bills. He asked whether the Premier would allow the motion to be considered before going into the question of redistribution.

THE PREMIER: There was no reason why, if the hon. member succeeded in carrying his motion, the Bill should not be recommitted. There would be no objection to that course.

MR. MORAN: That was waste of time, surely.

THE PREMIER objected to assuming that the motion would be carried, and it would not be well to delay the consideration of the Bill until the result of the motion was known. Should the motion be carried, there would be ample time for reconsidering the Bill and altering it accordingly.

MR. MORAN: More delay. The Premier proposed to go into the Bill now, and later it might be necessary to alter the measure. That was tinkering with the question. He asked members to say that the answer of the Premier to his request was not satisfactory; that we should first deal with the number of members for both Houses. The motion which stood in his name on the Notice Paper was entitled to the respect of the House, and if the House did not so regard it, he knew where to get a hearing. Frequently last session Bills were reconsidered on the third reading, and

the forms of the House allowed this to be done. This was the proper time to reconsider whether we should alter a decision already come to by the House, as decisions were altered last session on the third reading both in regard to the number of members and the method of distribution of seats in this House.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 3, 4—agreed to.

First Schedule (Electoral Provinces) :

MR. MORAN : The proposition of the schedule was to divide the Upper Chamber into nine provinces, and this was what was called an Upper House, supposed to view calmly and with statesmanlike gaze any hasty legislation sent up from this lower House. We had a property Chamber entirely in this Lower House at the present time, and the Upper House was also to be elected on a property qualification entirely ; but surely the Government which proposed to leave this Assembly as a property House might view with some little favour a proposition to equally distribute representation for the other property House. Since this Chamber was elected largely on the pocket borough system, we might give to the other Chamber the semblance of being a reviewing House ; and if we must have nine provinces, as he assumed from the Bill, surely we might at least, since the other House was elected on a property franchise, have that franchise distributed on a population basis amongst those actually holding the property qualification. If this Lower House was not to be a popular Chamber elected on something like a population basis, so as to have some semblance of a people's House, then let us give to that other Chamber a semblance of popular representation amongst all those who had the property franchise ; that was to say, let us make a vote for the Upper House of equal value with a vote for the Lower House. The present Government were practically proposing in the Bill that the people of this State should not have representation in either Chamber ; for in this Chamber ten votes in his electorate (West Perth) would be nullified by one vote given in the Upper House ; and this was called popular government ! He asked, why should not the nine provinces return members to the Upper Chamber on a population basis equally distributed

amongst those people who held property and had the franchise ? His conviction was that the people in this State were going to demand something real instead of a sham, in the form of redistribution of seats. They were going to resent this combination of different forces in this House to keep out popular government. The people wanted a Parliament elected on the principle of a party of progress and a party of retrogression, if such there must be. The people were beginning to say that those representatives in Parliament who thought together should sit together. The people of the country were wanting to know why the great Liberal Government which came in with such a flourish of trumpets had so largely gone back on every promise made when before the electors. The people would want to know why the members of a Government who had previously, in season and out of season, opposed the forward policy of Sir John Forrest when as Premier he was striving to develop the resources of this State, were now striving to prevent the people getting a fair representation in Parliament. It was time to ask this question, and he asked it because he was jealous for the reputation of the Parliament of this State, for one thing. He wanted the Upper House to be a popular House, and not one that would drop into disrespect and disuse. This Parliament had to hold up its hands against the aggression of the Commonwealth Parliament ; so he wanted this to be a strong Chamber entirely, and he wanted the other to be at least a revising House free from the petty jealousies of parochial legislation. It was proposed in the Bill to divide the State into nine provinces for the election of an Upper House ; yet every representative there would be a parochial representative. Let the Government propose to elect that House on a broad franchise, making this State one electorate if they liked—that would at least be a forward proposal—and make the other Chamber representative of the whole of the State, so that members of the Council should not, like members of this Assembly, be compelled to study the interests of their particular localities as well as the interests of the State as a whole. The Upper Chamber should consist of representative men who would be strong and fearless.

He was not in favour of the abolition of the Upper Chamber just yet; but if it were proposed to have two property Houses in this State, he would rather say that if property and people were to be represented by men sitting cheek-by-jowl, let them sit together in the same House. Representatives in the Upper Chamber should be strong and fearless, and should view legislation from the standpoint of the State as a whole and not of particular localities. They should be men strong in the knowledge that if they offended the electors in one part of the State by not approving of some public work in a locality, they would have the rest of the country behind them. The remaining remnant of the late popular member for East Perth (Hon. Walter James) was developing into a strong conservative. He evinced the completest distrust of the people of this State. He was in full charge of a patient majority in this Chamber; he came into office when those sitting in Opposition were full in numbers and very patient; he was allowed to develop his policy without obstruction; he had then a full and free hand to propose a redistribution of seats that would meet with popular approval. Instead of doing so he tinkered and played with the question, and was now playing into the hands of those few persons in the country who had always evinced the greatest distrust of newcomers. Without blaming those persons too much for their attitude of distrust, we now saw the Premier acting with them in trying to hold the power in a few hands and not giving fair-play to all parts of the State. If the Premier and those supporting him argued that a minority represented in Parliament would be fair to the majority who were not represented here, why could we not equally argue that the majority might be trusted to act fairly to a minority? This was the old policy of distrust, against which he asked the House and the country to protest vigorously, disregarding quibbles to the effect that this was not the time, or that the time had gone past for considering this question. The forms of the House gave full opportunity for considering it. It had not been properly considered; it ought to be considered, and a clean-cut issue placed before the electors, leaving Liberals and

Conservatives clearly defined. If there was to be a popular Chamber and a vigorous State Parliament in this country, there must be clean-cut issues such as we had when Sir John Forrest was the apostle of progress and his opponents were the apostles of retrogression in public works. There must still be a vigorous policy of development in parliamentary representation carried on by those who trusted the people as against those who would not yet trust them. Let us respect both parties, but let us know who they were. Let not the country be led aside by supposed party issues which were not party issues at all, nor be befooled by the semblance of parties in this Chamber, but judge by the division lists of the difference between one section of the House and others. Let those who in this Chamber represented democracy, the Labour party, assist him (Mr. Moran), when the time came, to thresh out this question in the House preparatory to threshing it out in the country. Let him not be told that he should have been here earlier in the session. That was his fault, and for it he would answer. Mayhap he was just as well engaged elsewhere. But having only one vote, he could not carry a measure single-handed; so he asked the House to reconsider the question of redistribution, and did so as one who had always believed in trusting the people, and in progress both as to public works and parliamentary representation, as one who fought in this Chamber eight years ago for payment of members, abolition of the plural vote, and for redistribution as it was needed from time to time—for the very rudiments of popular freedom. He pointed with pride to the fact that in Australasia those States with popular Parliaments were prosperous, while those without popular Parliaments were not prosperous. New Zealand and South Australia were the best-governed States south of the line, with every industry well attended to, farming included. South Australia was a poor country, but excellent use was made of its every asset, and that under a popular Government. There was no greater democrat in Australia than Mr. Kingston, the man who had made South Australia what it was to-day, the man whom it was the fashion to-day to cry down because he took an independent

course. To-day no State in the world was more prosperous than New Zealand, where no industry was neglected and no section of the community interfered with. Compared with other States, New Zealand had the largest production per head of population, and her popular Government did not injure the farmer, but threw open to him markets all over the world. But our sham democracy here, headed by the once promising democrat of East Perth (the Premier) was flouting the people, and kept up this travesty of dividing the country into little tinpot electorates. The member for the Williams (Hon. F. H. Piesse) and others in Opposition should not be led away in this matter by the Government, but should trust the people. But that member, as the remnant of the great party which by fearless legislation and by opening up the State had made the country what it was to-day, he (Mr. Moran) would like to see at or near the head of a popular party carrying on the policy of the Forrest Government as it would be carried on by Sir John Forrest were he with us now. Having proved the success of his forward policy, Sir John Forrest would to-day have been prepared to give popular representation to this country, and the remnant of his followers ought not to become retrogressive. A member interjected that the remnant were on the Government side. Many of them were. Some members, being law-abiding citizens, would support any Government in power; and perhaps the Government side was the best side for a member whose only object in Parliament was to get his own constituency looked after. No doubt we all had to do that; but was the House prepared to admit the fairness of dividing the representation of the Upper House, the revising Chamber, among nine electorates, thus promoting cabals and leaving every question to be viewed from the standpoint of some little corner of the country? Would it not be wiser for those who believed in an Upper Chamber to look to its foundations and make them firmer? Make it a good, broad, liberal House, on a property franchise if desired. Let the Assembly be as far as possible on a population basis, representing the will of the majority. A time would come when people would be convinced of the necessity for some great reform; and

then a battle between the two Houses would be a battle worthy of the name. It would result from a steady, onward pressure from the Lower House; and personally he would never object to resistance from the Upper Chamber. What if legislation were retarded for a year? That had frequently happened, with no ill-effect. But at the only time in the history of this State when the Upper House should have taken a firm stand had they done so? What did they do when it was proposed to hand over this country, fettered and unprotected, to a federation? Did they stand firmly as they might have done, and demand another year's delay, or did they weakly give way? History would answer.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: That was under the old Government.

MR. MORAN: Whether the old or the new Government, it was the same. Did the hon. member wish to infer that the Upper House was then under the thumb of his Government, as it was now under the thumb of the present Government?

HON. F. H. PIESSE: And not a bad thing, either.

MR. MORAN: The hon. member admitted the fact. He (Mr. Moran) had heard it alleged before, but had not known till now that it was true. It was well for the country to know it. The Upper House should be above this Chamber and above the Government; not taking cognisance of parties, saving as they represented the popular will and the general welfare. But what was the reason why another place did not stand firm on the federation question, insisting on a Transcontinental Railway or some other *quid pro quo* before joining with the East? The Upper House said: "Why, we cannot withstand a tremendous expression of popular opinion." That was the only reason given. The "impact," as they called it, was too great, and they succumbed to it. Was it not the argument of those who maintained that the Upper Chamber had a steadying influence that when there was a tremendous expression of popular will, that Chamber would give way? Were they not supposed to give way when, after one or two expressions of public opinion, it was clear that the people willed a certain course? Were they not there for the

purpose of steady legislation? Not to be absolute judges for all time of what the country wanted, but rather that they might do as they did last session when they sent back to this House the Premier's precious Constitution Bill, which the Premier brought up again this session, having meekly abandoned every one of the amendments originally proposed, thus giving us a colourless Bill without even one of the great alterations proposed last session. That was perhaps a case where the Upper Chamber did good. But to make that Chamber valued and respected as it should be, let it be elected on some non-parochial basis, representing, for instance, the metropolitan area, the great agricultural industry, the great goldfields industry, and the great northern pastoral industry. Then, though interests would be represented, they would at least be represented on a broad basis. The members representing the metropolitan area would take a broad view of what was good for the metropolis. The agricultural representative would not trouble his mind about some little railway in a distant part of the State, but would consider the interests of the whole agricultural industry. He who represented the Eastern Goldfields would try to benefit the gold-mining industry, without regard to some imaginary line between Coolgardie and Kalgoorlie representing nothing; and the man who represented the great North would consider whether proposed legislation was fair or unfair towards his extensive portion of the State. Such representatives would be more independent, and therefore their judgment would not be parochial. To divide Upper House provinces as proposed would be most retrogressive, not at all in keeping with the times, with goodwill between the old settlers and the new, or with the prosperity and progress of our Eastern Goldfields. No longer ought goldfields settlers to be called birds of passage, for they were here for life; their homes were assuming the appearance of the homes of older settlers; they were part and parcel of the State, and were one with other colonists in upholding its interests against the Commonwealth. He protested vigorously against this sham Bill. The time was approaching when the people would demand that this House should be sepa-

rated into two camps, one representing liberalism, progress, democracy, and the full rights of the people, as against those who said they were not yet prepared to trust the people.

MR. HASTIE: The preceding speaker might have concluded with an amendment, to show what he wanted.

MR. MORAN: That would not have affected the hon. member's action; for he was a mere stalking-horse for the Government.

MR. HASTIE: To-day he had told the hon. member that he would move to send back the schedule to the select committee, on the ground that the proportions in the population of the provinces were too great; and the hon. member had promised his assistance. To-night the hon. member summoned the Labour party to his own assistance; so one might have expected from him some original proposal. He (Mr. Hastie) now moved as an amendment:—

That the schedule be referred to a select committee, with a view to a more equitable redistribution of seats.

If this proposal were not in order, would the Chairman suggest an alternative course? Members who knew how different parts of the State were populated could see at a glance the unreasonableness of the schedule. The numbers of the voters for the Upper House he would take would be those on the rolls of the different State electorates of which each province was composed. The East Province contained 19,600 electors, the Central Province 6,600, the Metropolitan Province 23,700, the North Province 8,385 electors, the North-West Province 2,504 electors, the South Province—and this was the province about which the member for West Perth made the pathetic appeal to the member for the Williams—contained 6,286 electors, the South-East Province contained 18,206 electors, and the South-West Province 10,045 electors, and as near as he could get it—he believed it was not very far out—the West Province contained 19,457 electors. If members had taken a note of the figures, they would see the great disparity between the electors of the different provinces. He was not one who believed under all circumstances that we should have an absolute population basis. Such a thing was impossible in a State like Western Aus-

tralia; but population was a great point, and we should not deliberately shut out of consideration the basis of population altogether. There was the North Province, which no one would expect should get exactly the same representation as say the Eastern Goldfields or the Metropolitan Province; but the disparity was something enormous. It surely must be considered out of proportion when 2,405 electors living in the North Province had the same representation as 23,700 electors living within the metropolitan area. That disparity only required to be pointed out to show that we should try to get an improvement on the present figures. There was a doubt, which we should bear in mind, whether the Bill when finally adopted would contain a provision for 30 or 27 members; but the House had already agreed that there should be 27 members; and it was the duty of the Committee to redistribute the 27 seats for the Council in the best and fairest way possible.

MR. MORAN: Why not consider the number of provinces first?

MR. HASTIE: We had considered the number of provinces in the House two or three times, and if he thought there was the slightest hope of getting a reduction he would do his utmost to have it reconsidered again. The member for West Perth complained that he should be given an opportunity. [MR. MORAN: The House should have an opportunity.] The House should have an opportunity of reducing the number of provinces. We had a discussion the other day as to whether there should be 24 members in the Upper House or more. He (Mr. Hastie) and others strongly supported 24, but the House agreed to 27. That being so, let members accept the verdict of the House, and act on the basis of 27. It would be impossible for any member to sketch out any particular scheme, but he moved the motion to allow members an opportunity of indicating the direction in which they would like the select committee to move. The object he had was to see the political power in the House distributed as widely as possible.

MR. MORAN: It was not right that the partial statement of the case made by the member for Kanowna should go abroad without stating what actually did occur. The member for Kanowna said

he intended to move to recommit the Upper House schedule on the basis of nine provinces, and he (Mr. Moran) replied that if he could not carry the major proposition he would help the hon. member with the minor proposition. The hon. member for Kanowna was not acting in the best interests in refusing to reconsider the major proposition. Last session the hon. member helped the Government to recommit Bills on the third reading, and important alterations were made in a thin House. He would help the hon. member in anything that would go towards broadening the representation in the country. This was early in the session, the Budget had not yet been delivered; therefore there was plenty of time to consider the matter. The hon. member for Kanowna had stated that he listened to hear what motion he (Mr. Moran) had to make. He had taken an opportunity of stating his views on the question at the earliest possible moment, and did not speak directly of nine or six or four provinces, but had stated his views on the whole matter of the redistribution of seats and the relative proportion of the two Houses. He wished he could accuse the hon. member of ignorance on that point, but he did not do so.

MR. TAYLOR: Before recording his vote in favour or against a new select committee, he would like to know if it was intended to follow the usual practice adopted since he had been a member of the House of knowing exactly who was going on the select committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: There could be no select committee moved for at this stage.

MR. MORAN: That was lively!

MR. TAYLOR: That was worse.

MR. MORAN: Get a new paint-brush.

MR. DAGLISH: Before the motion was put it was only reasonable to get the statement from the chairman of the select committee as to the basis upon which the representation had been allotted. The member for Kanowna had pointed out the anomalies that existed in regard to the various districts, and it was reasonable that members should have some explanation of the anomalies before going to a vote on the question. At present no justification had been attempted of the abolition of certain provinces and the establishment or subdivision of other

provinces. The Committee were entitled to know the grounds on which the changes had been made, and the basis—he presumed there was some basis adopted by the select committee—which led them to the conclusion embodied in their report. At present the anomalies seemed to be so great that he was unable to fathom any justification for them. He did not know if there was any better way of expressing an opinion upon the matter than by such an amendment as the member for Kanowna had proposed, to refer the matter back to the select committee. Surely carrying an amendment like that did indicate that members were not satisfied with the distribution, and if members thought that the same select committee was not likely to bring up a better recommendation after the second recommendation had been brought up, members would have the right of rejecting it likewise. He hoped the member for West Perth and those who thought with him would join in supporting the amendment, so that there would be an opportunity for the realisation of the opinions the member had expressed.

MR. TAYLOR: Some opinion should be given by the Government on the question. After the speech of the member for West Perth, one could only come to the conclusion there was a conspiracy of silence on the part of the Government on this important Bill. The Redistribution of Seats Bill was a measure which the people of the State watched closely. It was the general cry of members of Parliament and people outside Parliament that the Government were being supported by sections in the House who believed in the sincerity of Ministers with reference to the Redistribution of Seats Bill. When we had that measure before us, the Premier being the chairman of the select committee who had arranged the Redistribution of Seats Bill, and when members rose and condemned the Bill at this stage and the member for Kanowna, who was also a member of the select committee, spoke at length, it was only right to hear something from the Government benches.

THE PREMIER said he was quite willing to explain.

MR. TAYLOR: The Premier should explain so as to place members in possession of the facts; but there were mem-

bers who had not been examined before the committee, and their electorates had been cut up or redistributed, and these members were not called upon to explain how the redistribution would affect their electorates. The district he represented had been divided into two parts, and he would show how absolutely ignorant the committee were with reference to that district. The committee had drawn a line through Mount Margaret, cutting off one portion of the electorate so far as population was concerned, and they called it "Kurrajong." They had only taken in the Mount Margaret electorate the following places: Murrin Murrin, Laverton, Morgans, Burtville, and the outlying district of Erliston, 75 miles from Laverton, and extending over a very large area with not a very large population. Here was a small population who desired a Government public battery. The people wanted facilities to crush their ore. There were about 250 prospectors at that place and there was no way of treating their stone. These men were all hanging on to their "shows," but were in no way able to treat their stone. He failed to see how the Premier or the select committee which drew up this scheme of redistribution were going to find sufficient voters on the roll for those places to make an electorate. When we took men who had no practical knowledge of the geography of the country they were representing, they failed to know the interests which they should know. According to the map they had cut off from the Menzies electorate, which the Minister for Mines had the honour to represent, one of the largest and most prosperous gold-mining camps in that electorate—Kookynie. He supposed that was the largest in area, and he believed the new rolls would show there were more voters there than in any other gold-mining camp in the electorate. That was cut off and placed in the Kurrajong electorate. That being so they placed all these important centres in the Kurrajong electorate—Kookynie, Malcolm, Leonora, Lawlers, Mount Sir Samuel, Lake Darlôt. The portion of the Mount Margaret electorate to be called Kurrajong was very prosperous and likely to develop very quickly. The other portion of Mount Margaret, which was to retain the name of Mount Margaret, would have only a

small population. The Anaconda copper mine, near Murrin Murrin, was only partially worked, but it had a great future. He did not know the number of voters who would be there, but it had been under examination for some time previous to the last census being taken for the Federal Government, and they had started work again. He did not know how many had been employed, but did not suppose the number was much over 200. [Interjection.] In the East Province there were Brown Hill, Ivanhoe, Kanowna, Kurrajong, Menzies, and Mount Margaret. It would be idle for this to be passed here and have to be altered later on. That would be in keeping with the way in which the Government dealt with these matters last year. Last year we carried alterations of the Constitution Bill against the Constitution Act, and we had to recommit the measure to be in order. The committee appointed to deal with the Redistribution of Seats Bill had had an opportunity of considering the measure, and we had their considerations here, but they were absolutely of no value. There was a desire to have the measure committed to them again. The only way, however, for any committee to do any good with this Bill was to have a committee consisting of members who knew something about the country, and who would not desire to do something for their own particular portions of the State which they represented, but would do a fair thing for the State as a whole and endeavour to recommend a workable measure. It seemed to him there was something which had caused this line to be drawn between Niagara and Kookynie with the object of putting Kookynie in the Kurrajong electorate, and also putting the Granites in. He knew there had been great dissatisfaction there for a long time. He was perfectly satisfied the Premier had some idea as to how the Government stood in that portion of the State when the Government carved off the most important gold-mining camp in the Minister for Mines' electorate. That was taken off simply to make it easier for the Minister's return at the next election. The division made was a very bad one, and showed how utterly incapable the committee was to deal with the Bill. It was useless to refer this Bill to the same committee

again. If there was any machinery by which we could have a new committee without the Government and the Opposition putting their heads together, a committee appointed by men who had travelled over this State and who knew something about the country, and not footpath politicians of which we had too many in this Chamber, he would support it.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Taking the figures as far as we could get them, we had four provinces in which the total number of electors was 23,676, and those four provinces returned 12 members. We had one province called the Metropolitan Province which returned three members, and there were 23,700 electors. It was not desirable that we should settle the Redistribution of Seats Bill solely on a population basis, but surely there should be some explanation which would justify such a position as this. Surely the Bill was not based upon the population question. Then we had another point, the question of territory. On what grounds did we get such a division as this—Central Province: Northam, Swan, Toodyay, and York? We did not get it on the ground of population, for the population was only 6,000, nor did we get it on the ground of interests, because the interests were all the same. We had to deal, however, with another province, the North Province, where we had Cue, Geraldton, Greenough, Irwin, Mount Magnet, and the Murchison. We had the goldfields entirely outweighed by the other portions of the province. On what basis had this redistribution been made? It was not made on a population basis, nor on the basis of territory or interest. What principles had ruled the committee in dealing with the question? How did the Premier justify there being 12 members for 23,676 electors, and only three members for 23,700?

THE PREMIER: One did not want to travel over ground he travelled over several times last session, and several times this session. Members were very anxious in dealing with figures to point out that this redistribution was not on a population basis. He had said till he was tired of doing so that the Bill was not framed on a purely population basis. He had not heard a member of this House urge that the Bill should be

based entirely on population. That being so, it was idle to say that two and two were four, and four being twice as many as two should have twice as much representation. Members had to realise that there were in the State various interests to which it was desired to give some representation. He had travelled over this ground when introducing the Constitution Bill last session and again this session. It was very easy indeed to raise objections to any scheme of redistribution. Nothing was simpler. The only difficulty was to bring forward an alternative scheme. The member for West Perth (Mr. Moran) was not dealing with the redistribution, his argument being as to whether the redistribution should be on another principle which he had in his mind. The member for Mt. Margaret (Mr. Taylor) was simply dealing with the manner in which his particular electorate had been cut up, his sole grievance being that it was cut up in a way he did not like, and he had abused the select committee for failing to realise that the electorate should be cut up in some other way. The hon. member had said not one word on provincial classification. He was a member for the town pump, and his little mind could not get away from his own electorate. That was the difficulty in dealing with questions like this. The little man always came forward with difficulties, because the scheme propounded did not happen to coincide with his local ideas. The hon. member (Mr. Taylor) could not look at the question in any other way, and his speech therefore caused one no surprise. There were, however, other members who were not solely concerned in one particular electorate, and who realised that the State consisted of several electorates, and it was these whom he wished to address. The committee had to distribute the electorate among nine provinces. The hon. member for Kanowna (Mr. Hastie) had very correctly pointed out that there were provinces with small population as opposed to provinces with a very large number of electors, instancing the East and South-East Provinces. Comparisons of this nature were based upon the number of electors for the Assembly. The proportion of Upper House electors to the electors for the Assembly was larger in agricultural elec-

torates than in metropolitan areas. There must be a disproportion. The East Province contained 19,000 electors, and the South-East Province 18,000, these two being purely goldfields provinces, while the Metropolitan Province, the largest province of any, contained 23,000 electors. It must be also borne in mind that the West Province was a metropolitan province in the same sense that the East Province and South-East Province were regarded as goldfields provinces. The South-East and East Provinces were both populous goldfields centres, and the Metropolitan and West Provinces were practically metropolitan areas controlled by Perth and Fremantle. If, to remove the disproportion that existed, another province were added to the metropolitan area, the result would be that instead of having six members for the metropolitan area there would be nine, as opposed to the six for the populous goldfields centres. The Metropolitan and West Provinces together totalled 43,000 electors and, divided into three provinces, there would be in each representation about 14,000 electors. At once the contrast would arise when these 14,000 provinces were compared with the 19,000 electors in the East Province or the 18,000 in the South-East Province. It was very difficult to avoid such a contrast whatever was done, and if another province were given to Perth there would arise the objection from the goldfields that the metropolitan area was to have nine representatives to the six for the goldfields area. Again, there would be the additional effect that, by giving an extra province to the metropolitan area, a province must be taken from the agricultural areas. Should the Central Province and the South Province be so combined as to form one province, three members would represent 13,000 voters. In this connection it was known that in agricultural areas the proportion of Upper House voters to Assembly voters was larger than in populous centres. [HON. F. H. PIESSE: Taking the figures before the House and without assuming that there was a larger proportion of Upper House voters in the Central and South Provinces, three members would be given to 13,000 agricultural votes extending over an area of hundreds of miles, and the same number

of members to 14,000 metropolitan votes. Agricultural electors would naturally and reasonably object.

**MR. MORAN:** Why did the Premier drag in the Assembly votes at all? It was most absurd. He should deal with those who had the votes for the Upper House.

**THE PREMIER:** The objections raised by members had been based on the Assembly figures, and he was dealing with those objections. The agricultural areas would reasonably object to merely having three representatives for 13,000 votes under such conditions. In electorates running from Toodyay to Albany, agricultural voters could say they were only given the same representation as was given to a metropolitan area, when it was admitted all round by the Redistribution of Seats Bill that in the Lower House they were entitled to a larger proportion of representation than the metropolitan area. The agricultural voters could also claim that it was cast upon three men who represented a province of eight electorates to follow their electors right from Toodyay to Albany, and having covered the whole of that space, to hold meetings at the various centres. [**HON. F. H. PRIESE:** Swan was also in that province.] There would be also the territorial objection that the provinces extended from Guildford to Albany. The same objections could be found against the representation in the Lower House on a population basis pure and simple.

**MR. DAGLISH:** Agricultural districts were given four times the representation of the metropolitan area in both Houses.

**THE PREMIER:** The Federal Parliament started with the theory that representation must be on a population basis, but found the scheme utterly impracticable the first time it was applied.

**MR. MORAN:** Why was it impracticable? It meant that it did not suit the Federal Government.

**THE PREMIER:** The Federal Government, the Labour party, and a portion of the Opposition formed an overwhelming majority of the Federal Parliament, which, when called upon to apply the theory embodied in the Electoral Act, found it could not work. [**MR. BATH:** It was a question of boundaries.] The whole question of redistribution of seats

was a question of boundaries, more or less. Redistribution could not be had purely on a population basis. If members could suggest some other scheme on the basis of nine provinces, more equitable, it would be listened to gladly; but members could turn this scheme over in their minds fully and frequently and would find out the difficulty of bringing forward a scheme that would not be open to some of the objections, if not to all, laid against this scheme of the select committee. It was impossible in nine provinces to bring interests together. The member for Cue (**Mr. Illingworth**) had pointed out that in the North Province some of the goldfields were combined with Geraldton and the Irwin. These were interests not similar and not sympathetic; but it could not be avoided, it could not be overcome by joining the Murchison Goldfields to the Eastern Goldfields. It was questionable whether the Murchison or the Eastern Goldfields would like that done, and such a large area would be practically unworkable. If members would look at this scheme and bear in mind the difficulties in propounding one, they would find that the scheme of redistribution was the fairest that could be devised, unless the number of provinces were increased.

**MR. BATH:** Members were not in a position to produce a better scheme. They had not the figures available nor the services of the Chief Surveyor to mark out electorates. It should be sufficient for the House to instruct the select committee or to give them to understand that a scheme was required on a reasonable basis of representation. The select committee, acting on that, could have brought forward something that would more nearly meet the views of members. The Premier had said that the Federal Parliament found representation on a popular basis impracticable. He (**Mr. Bath**) denied the statement. Quite a different question was at issue in the allotment of Federal representation. In Queensland, for instance, a State officer was appointed to allot the Federal electorates, and some leading State Ministers brought influence to bear on that officer.

**THE PREMIER:** Why make that statement, when the Federal officer denied it?

MR. BATH: There was sufficient evidence brought forward to show that there was a great deal in the charge.

THE PREMIER: Not having seen the evidence, such a statement should not be made here.

MR. BATH: It was said that the Queensland electorates were allotted so as to favour the Queensland Ministry, and as far as possible to defeat the Labour members.

THE PREMIER: What about New South Wales?

MR. BATH: In New South Wales the opposing parties were not so much the State Ministry and the Labour party as the freetraders and the protectionists; hence the freetrade party were favoured in the allotment of boundaries. These matters, and not representation on a population basis, formed the basis of the objections raised in the Federal Parliament. It was unfair to use such an argument to support the scheme in this Bill. The Government said: "We must arrange the electorates to give representation of interests." That step was absolutely dangerous. The great objection to the scheme of representation hitherto in force was that it gave representation to interests and gave certain sections of the community representation in this Chamber altogether out of proportion to their numbers. Those sections had used their power against other sections not represented here, and were now using it to promote a scheme of representation absolutely unjust, and inadequate to giving proper representation to sections of the people just as deserving as those who received special consideration. When the Bill was referred to a select committee, he asked whether the House could lay down any proportion of the population for the electorates, or any scheme whatever which the select committee could follow so as to make the Bill harmonise with the opinion of the House; and the Premier replied that it was against the usual practice to give instructions to a select committee. Members who asked for a more equitable basis of representation did not ask for representation absolutely on a population basis, knowing that there were scattered electorates which could hardly be represented on that basis. But those members said that if representation were to be given to scattered electorates, such electorates

in farming districts should be given no greater consideration than similar electorates on the goldfields. The goldfields electors were just as deserving as the agricultural, for they were doing as much good for the country. Had the select committee gone to work on that basis, we should have had something like a workable scheme, of which the majority of the people would approve. But the select committee, even if they recognised the impossibility of pleasing the whole of the House, had not done their best to try to please us; and that was why members objected to the present scheme.

MR. NANSON: Nominally the Committee were considering the first schedule; but presumably the whole of the report of the select committee could be discussed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Members had wandered from the schedule, but should keep as close to it as possible.

MR. NANSON: There had not yet been an opportunity of discussing the report as a whole.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes; before the Speaker left the Chair.

MR. NANSON: As the report had not previously been discussed, presumably members would be allowed to deal with the general question. Such a course would save time; otherwise the report must continue to be discussed while the remaining portions of the Bill were being dealt with. From one point of view the report was most disappointing; from another it was only what might be expected from the personnel of the select committee—a Government committee, composed of the strongest supporters of the Ministry, such as the member for Kanowna (Mr. Hastie)—what stronger supporter of the Government than he? What stronger supporter of the Government than the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Pigott)? Why, the new definition of "leader of the Opposition" was, "a gentleman who supports the Government on every occasion when they happen to be in danger." Also on the select committee was the member for the Williams (Hon. F. H. Piesse), who moved to the Opposition benches when it became apparent that the direct Opposition were no longer a source of danger to the Government. This interesting quartette was completed by the Premier and the Government whip (Mr. Higham). In

these circumstances it was difficult to regard the report seriously as an impartial document. We should look on it as a report by members representing only one side of the House and one set of ideas, and that set the most conservative and reactionary to be found in the Chamber. The Premier had given what by courtesy might be called an explanation of the motives actuating the select committee in allotting the Council provinces. One could not say the explanation was clear; but other members of the select committee might fill up the gaps left by the Premier, and make clear what he left obscure. It was impossible for anyone who believed in representation on a population basis in the most modified degree—and nothing but a very modified degree could be hoped for from the present House—to approve of the suggestions of the select committee. It was somewhat consoling that if the schedule were passed something would be done to bring us nearer the goal he (Mr. Nanson) had earnestly sought—the adoption of a single-chamber Constitution; for unquestionably an Upper House composed as now suggested would not command the confidence or the respect of the country. A most deadly blow was aimed at a bicameral Constitution when one Chamber was so constituted that it could not be regarded as truly representative of the people. Even now none could say that the Upper House was either idolised or venerated by the people. At every election for that House the great mass of electors cared little or nothing for the issues at stake, or who was returned; because they had come to regard another place as an excrescence on the body politic; and to pass this Bill in its present form would intensify the feeling. In this House to-day one found perhaps a more conservative Chamber than existed under the Forrest régime, to which the member for West Perth (Mr. Moran) looked back with longing when he contrasted it with the present position. It was almost lamentable that the hon. member should have to admit that the present Parliament were more conservative than the Parliament which certain members, now partly in Opposition and partly on the Government side, had condemned three years ago as needing reform. Instead of going forward we had

actually gone back. As to constitutional questions, we had in this House to-day a Government many times more conservative than the Government of which the member for Northam (Hon. G. Throssell) was Premier, and in which the member for West Perth (Mr. Moran) held a portfolio. No doubt had the Constitution Bill and this Bill been dealt with earlier in the life of the present Parliament, instead of being left till its last days, when a spirit of political apathy had apparently settled over the country, we should have had a much more radical, progressive, and popular measure than this. The apathy and calm that existed throughout the country in regard to redistribution of seats might not be quite so real as some hon. members imagined, or if it be real it might be the calm that preceded the storm. He would ask the member for West Perth, who looked at the political situation at the present time with a degree of pessimism, not to be discouraged, but to remember that to every cloud there was a silver lining. It might be that at present the cause of reform and progress was almost lost, but he asked the member for West Perth to remember that the atmosphere of the House was not the atmosphere of the country and not to mistake the sentiments of members in the House as the sentiments expressed by the people of the country, for we must wait until the people had an opportunity of making themselves heard. The disappointing feature of the recommendations made in regard to the question of redistribution was the attitude assumed by the committee in regard to the representation of the northern portion of the South-Western land division of the State. It had always been contended by the agricultural members in the House, and indeed he thought by the great bulk of members, that we could not at present hope for representation on the basis of population. It was scarcely necessary to labour that point; that had been agreed to by both sections of the House, and it had been found that in accordance with that view a specially liberal amount of representation had been given to the agricultural interests of Western Australia. He did not quarrel with that because he thought that at the present stage when one looked forward to a more

sweeping measure of reform it was a wise thing if one could not get the whole loaf to take what one could get. We should also recognise that the welfare of Western Australia was largely bound up with the welfare of the agricultural industry, therefore he thought he was right in saying in regard to the representation in the Assembly, that so far no strong protest had been uttered by members even on the Labour benches against the principle of giving agricultural members a fair share of representation. It might have been thought that when the question of dividing the agricultural seats amongst the agricultural portions of the State was being considered the same principle would be observed as when the question of dividing the mining and the urban constituencies was raised. But that was not so. We found the whole brunt of the distribution fell on the northern portion of Western Australia, the great portion between Gingin and the Murchison River, one of the finest, he believed the finest, portion of Western Australia to-day. Only a few minutes before he rose to speak he was informed of a large price obtained for an estate at public auction sold that day in that portion of Western Australia, and if we looked back in the history of Western Australia it would be found that the earlier settlers, without exception, who were good judges of land, when they took up country they did not go to the swamps of the South-West, but they went in the vicinity of Champion Bay, and we found to-day that these estates were the best and largest in Australia. It was true that large estates were to be found elsewhere, and a fair number had been bought by the Government under the provisions of the Land Purchase Act, but almost without exception these large estates were in the more southern portion of the South-Western division, what were described as derelict estates, like the great Peel estate near Rockingham, and were taken up in the early days and never turned to profitable account. In the Champion Bay district and the Irwin one saw such estates as the Glengarry, the Newmarracarra, and the Mt. Irwin all within easy distance of Geraldton; these estates were in a high state of development and carrying a large number of stock, and had been so valuable to the

individual owners that that very fact made it difficult for the Government to acquire them. The same fact that had given to these estates so much value for stock-raising purposes impeded the agricultural portions of the South-West Division [Hon. F. H. PIESSE interjected.] The hon. member knew a great deal about the Great Southern Railway.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: In 1872 and in 1875 he walked through that country.

MR. NANSON: The hon. member, who had done so much for the Great Southern Railway, might have done a great deal for the northern portion of the South-West Division. If the hon. member had only gone into the northern portion it might be found to be different from what it was to-day.

THE PREMIER: The hon. member should emulate the member for the Williams; start at Northampton.

MR. NANSON: The hon. member asked why not emulate the member for the Williams? So far as the northern portion was concerned that was what he had been endeavouring to do. The agricultural development and settlement in that portion of the State synchronised with the time he had represented the northern constituency. If the Government were going to distribute the agricultural electorates on the same principle as the electorates were distributed as a whole not on the strict principle of population, they should allow the northern portion of the South-Western land division a larger share of representation than had been permitted under the Redistribution of Seats Bill. As originally proposed and suggested, the Northampton electorate was merged into Greenough, and his (Mr. Nanson's) own electorate was merged into the Irwin. When that suggestion was made there was no complaint made by the members who were most affected. Personally he made no protest, because he always held that if we were going to reduce the number of members in the Assembly, then the thinly-populated districts should bear a considerable portion of the brunt of the reduction, and the merging of his constituency into the Greenough was perfectly fair. There was no opposition to the merging of Greenough into the Moore, but the House decided that no reduction of members of the Assembly should take place, but that the number

should be kept at 50; he had therefore supposed when the redistribution came before the select committee while the northern portion of the South-West division would only have been deprived of one of its members the chief reduction would have been made in the southern portion of the South-Western land division. That would mean that each portion of the South-Western land division would be dealt with equally. Instead of that it was found that an additional seat was given to the southern portion. He was interested to learn why that very manifest and equitable distribution was not assented to. He was aware that the member for the Williams would not conscientiously do anything unfair in his position as a member of the select committee, that he would not conscientiously champion the claims of his portion of the State; but there was such a thing as an unconscious bias, and with the known personality of the hon. member and his faith in that portion of the State and its claims to representation it was quite possible they weighed unduly with the committee.

**THE PREMIER:** Where would the hon. member put that district?

**MR. NANSON:** That was a point for the redistribution committee.

**THE PREMIER:** Would the hon. member have restored the Moore or Northampton?

**MR. NANSON:** So long as the northern portion of the South-Western agricultural division was given three seats, he did not care where the extra seat was to be. He was not fighting for a retention of his constituency. The Premier knew, he had told him privately, he had made no secret of the fact that if he looked at the matter from a selfish point of view it would be easier for him, if he went up for election again, which was very doubtful, it would be much easier for him to fight a constituency composed of Northampton, Champion Bay, and Greenough combined, than the constituency as at present composed. There was a special reason why the North should have, if anything, an unduly liberal proportion of agricultural members compared with what was given to the agricultural districts to the south and east of Perth. That part of the State had to deal with the Midland Railway Company, a company, whatever its merits or de-

merits, had not done anything to push forward settlement in that portion of the State. If it had been in the power of the northern members, that line would have been purchased long ago. It might have been purchased at one time at a price which was fairly reasonable; and if the Government had to give a quarter of a million more than it was worth at the time, by now we should have made up the money. The increased value given to the land along the line would have made more than the excess sum paid for it at that time. The Premier had referred to the tendency that some members had of looking at things from a parochial point of view, or as the Premier put it, from a village pump standpoint. It might be said from the remarks he (Mr. Nanson) had made that he was laying himself open to a charge of that kind, but he did not think he had laid himself open to that reproach. While he thought that all these questions should be looked at in a broad way, it was idle to close one's eyes to the fact, where sectional questions arose, they were likely to be settled by districts possessing the largest number of members.

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

**MR. NANSON (continuing):** One salient fact to which sufficient attention perhaps had not yet been given in the redistribution scheme was that some 15 seats were given to districts that were either purely agricultural or which comprised towns of so agricultural a nature that they might be regarded as agricultural constituencies. Out of those 15 electorates no less than 13 were situated either to the east or to the north of Perth. For that vast stretch of country extending from Gingin northwards to the Murchison River, the whole of which was agricultural with the exception of a very few miles just before one got to the Murchison River, there were only two agricultural members. On what ground did this disproportion exist? Was it that the northern portion of the agricultural division was less rich than the southern portion? Let the stock returns give their answer on that point, and that auction sale to which he had referred to-day of property in that northern dis-

trict. He did not care to what source of wealth one might go he would find that in every particular the north was equally as wealthy, equally as rich in potential resources, and in some respects even richer than those portions of the State to the south-west and to the east of Perth. If it were asked why that northern portion of the South-West Division had not gone ahead, had not progressed as much as the eastern and south-western portions, the answer was sufficiently evident. We knew in the first place that the development, the prosperity of that northern portion of the South-Western Division had been checked by the fact that the Midland Railway and the lands adjacent to it had been and unfortunately still were in the possession of a land grant railway company. The northern portion of the South-Western Division was penalised as against other portions of that division, because it had not the good fortune to have the Midland Railway purchased before the Great Southern Railway was purchased. If the Midland had been purchased before the Great Southern the positions would have been reversed. Then it would not have been his lot to plead for fair and equitable treatment, but for the member for the Williams (Hon. F. H. Piesse), and the member for Plantagenet (Mr. Hassell). We knew perfectly well that the only reason that had kept the Midland portion of the State backwards was the fact that the Midland Railway Company had been fastening upon its vitals and sapping the life blood from it; not merely preventing it from progressing and from increasing in vigour, but driving population away from Geraldton and the country round about Geraldton. What was the ground upon which those northern districts were to be denied equitable representation in this Chamber? The sole ground upon which they could be denied that representation was that their population was limited. And were we to understand that the agricultural members of this House, who were treated with special favour, not on the ground of population, but on the ground of interest; were we to understand that those agricultural members, while greedy to get representation for their own portion of the State, were going to deny it to the northern portion

because the northern portion, from no fault of its own, was denied that population to which it was justly entitled? He appealed especially to the agricultural members, particularly the members to the south of Perth and to the east of Perth. If they denied the claims of those in the northern districts, if they said that because of the paucity of the population there was in the northern districts the people there were not to have more than two members, then they were using a very dangerous argument against themselves. If they used that argument to do an injustice to the northern districts now, in another session of Parliament the same argument would be used against themselves. He had never disguised his feelings as to the basis upon which representation should be framed. He always had faith in the general wisdom of the people, and he believed that with absolute safety we could go very much farther than we had done in this Bill in assenting to the principle of representation upon a population basis. But whilst that was his opinion—and he had never hesitated to express it, although he represented an agricultural constituency—that was not the case with the great bulk of what were known as the country members in this House. The country members were on that point intensely and unchangingly conservative. They did not feel that the interests of the country would be safeguarded, that the interests of the farmer or of the pastoralist would be safeguarded, if representation were purely on a population basis. And yet, so far as the northern districts were concerned, they did not hesitate in this House to apply that very principle which they would object to have applied to themselves when we no longer had the case of one agricultural portion of the State against another but the goldfields and great towns against the agricultural districts. Unless hon. members were prepared to do justice to the North, an injustice was not merely being done to that portion of the State, but also an injustice to their own logic, their own argument, and their own principles. There could be no getting away from that. If it was a good thing not to base claims to the representation of population in the case of constituencies to the south-west and east of Perth,

surely the argument should apply to the northern electorates. There must be redistribution of seats, but redistribution could not be so perfect as it might have been had there been a reduction of members. From a political point of view the Government had cut a very poor and contemptible figure in so tamely surrendering the main provisions of the Constitution Bill in regard to the question of reduction of members—a question which had a very intimate bearing on the farther matter of redistribution of seats. Last session, when introducing the Constitution Bill, of which the present measure was virtually a reproduction, the Premier was perfectly explicit on the need and necessity for reduction, and pointed out that under the existing constitution there were many anomalies which could only be removed by a reduction in the number of members. If it were not that he would be wearying the Committee, he could read line after line to that effect, that the Premier had said there could be a fair distribution only by two methods—either by increasing the number or by decreasing the number of members. On that occasion the Premier had nailed his colours to the mast, so far as it was possible for the present Government to do so, but, when an attempt was made by the so-called Opposition to increase the number proposed in the Bill, the Premier and his colleagues, instead of making that a point on which they should either stand or fall, and instead of saying that they were determined not to give way and that there could be no satisfactory redistribution by maintaining the existing number, tamely surrendered their point, showing to the House and the country how much value was to be attached to their so-called convictions. A great deal of the inevitable trouble to be found in dealing with the Redistribution of Seats Bill was in the weak attitude of the Government when the Constitution Act Amendment Bill was before the Chamber. If the Government had remained firm it would not have been possible for the North to hold that its just claims had been scouted; but the number having been raised to 50, he could argue with every confidence in the justice and equity of his cause that the whole of the reduction should not fall on the agricultural countries north of Perth.

Out of three seats proposed to be taken away from the existing constituencies two were to be taken from these northern agricultural constituencies. Surely it was a reason that the vast tract of country to the north of Perth should have something more than absolutely fair representation, that the Midland Company controlled the huge portion of that territory in itself a sufficient handicap to the progress and prosperity of that portion of the State. It was now proposed that, because of the misfortune of having the Midland Company with its heavy hands over these many square miles of country, they should have the increased disability imposed of being practically disfranchised in the House. What could two members do in a district extending from Gingin to the Murchison River? It was held that, in the interests of the agricultural districts on the other side of Perth, it was necessary to have something like 18 members, but that two were sufficient for this north portion of the State. It had long been held by the North with justice that this portion of the State, within recent years, had not had its fair claims attended to, and the House should give to that portion of the State the consideration its resources commanded. In the first place its representatives laboured under the great disability of having to travel very long distances to reach Perth. No more severe tax on members' time could be imposed, and if they attempted to spend some portion of the session in their constituencies, the whole time of the members for Geraldton, Greenough and Irwin, would be swallowed up in travelling backwards and forwards along the Midland Railway. [Hon. F. H. PIESSE: The same equally applied to the southern members.] It did not apply in an equal degree. It might apply to the member for Plantagenet (Mr. Hassell) and to the member for the Williams (Hon. F. H. Piesse); but the members for the southern electorates had the advantage that the railways were run by the Government, generally with facilities not provided on the land-grant railway. It was impossible, in urging the matter, to do more than appeal to the sense of justice possessed by members. If attention was given to the subject, not only from the point of view of the North,

but even from the wider point of view of the State, it would be seen that a fair case had been made out for some more favourable consideration for the northern agricultural districts than had been given by the select committee. One would not contend for a moment that there should be no reduction of seats in the North. There was adequate and substantial justice in merging the two Kimberleys into one, and in depriving the agricultural districts of the North of at least one member; but when these districts were deprived of two members, while the other agricultural districts were not to suffer in the slightest degree, one could submit with confidence that members who looked at the question apart from the claims of their constituencies—members representing towns and goldfields—should see that justice was done between one agricultural portion of the State and another. The case for the North would bear the most searching investigation. Favours were not asked for, only fair play. One would be loth to think that, if its case had been substantiated, the claim of the North should be disregarded.

**MR. THOMAS:** It was a matter for regret that a real set of figures had not been given by the Premier, who might have put against each new province the number of Upper House electors. One was forced to take the figures of the Lower House electorates; but it was reasonable to assume that in each of these electorates there would be an equal proportion of Lower House electors qualified to vote for the Upper House. The Government proposal was disappointing. It was worse than that submitted last session, and opposed so strenuously by him. At the same time the attitude of the member for the Murchison, who had seen fit to attack the present leader of the Opposition and hinted that the Opposition were simply a reserve force for the Government, could not be understood. Last session it was proposed to have an Upper House of 24 members, 6 representing the goldfields, 6 the metropolitan area, and 12 the agricultural and pastoral interests. The present leader of the Opposition could not give his countenance to the Bill, and he (Mr. Thomas), who then sat on the cross-benches, had attacked it because of this proposal

regarding the Upper House, and because of proposals concerning the Assembly. He then thought some contract had been made between the Government and the country party, and fearing to allow the Bill to go into Committee he called for a division on the second reading. The then leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nanson) secured the adjournment of the debate after the Premier's speech on the Constitution and Redistribution of Seats Bill; and on resuming the debate he (Mr. Nanson) congratulated Ministers on having introduced a Bill conceived in no party spirit, drawn generally on broad lines, and disclosing in almost every sentence a desire to do justice to every part of the State, and to maintain the balance between the State's conflicting interests. The member for Boulder (Mr. Hopkins) then interjected an expression of doubt as to the fairness of the Bill. That Bill gave the agricultural and pastoral communities only 12 members out of 24, whereas this Bill gave them 15 out of 27. Later on in the same debate the hon. member (Mr. Nanson), referring to other schemes proposed for the amendment of the Constitution, said that if in the course of the debate there were other proposals he would welcome them, as he was not bound to the Government scheme; but he had nothing personally to suggest that would give a greater degree of satisfaction to the community as a whole. And the hon. member concluded by saying he recognised the spirit of compromise, the spirit of fairness in which the Bill had been conceived, and would like as a final word to express the pleasure with which he had heard the Premier's clear exposition of the principles which actuated the Government in reappportioning the representation; that it must be agreed that the Premier and his colleagues, in introducing the Bill, had not been guided at all by party considerations, but by an honest desire to do equal justice to each of the great producing interests of the State. Yet the hon. member (Mr. Nanson) now attacked the front Opposition bench, and unjustly called them a reserve force of the Government, the Government who now brought in a more liberal measure of representation for the agriculturists than the Bill they brought in last session. How could the hon. member expect any-

one to follow him after such a change of front as these extracts from his speech of last session proved him to have made? How could the hon. member support the Bill of last session and oppose this Bill, when the agriculturists, whom he apparently represented in this House, were getting infinitely more under this Bill than under the Bill of last session to which he gave his hearty support? The hon. member referred plaintively to his own and neighbouring electorates; but the hon. member's speech showed that he knew his own constituency was to be wiped out by the former Bill, which he admitted was conceived in all fairness.

MR. NANSON: And that he admitted to-night.

MR. THOMAS: Taking the Greenough, the Irwin, and Geraldton districts, there was an average of only 1,370 electors per member; and surely that was treating the district very liberally. The hon. member also objected that his district should not suffer from its lack of population, because this was due to the prevention of settlement by the Midland Railway Company. Many other country members might argue that for want of railways splendid lands in their districts could not be utilised, and that those districts should have increased representation in view of such disabilities. The Midland railway had not been purchased by the Government; the Great Southern railway had. But the Midland railway was better than nothing. His (Mr. Thomas's) constituency had splendid land and no railway at all; but he did not therefore grumble at its proposed representation in this Bill. The member for West Perth (Mr. Moran) was to be congratulated on his new policy for the guidance of this country, though he also suffered from lack of memory. This afternoon the hon. member repeatedly declared his intention to ask for a reduction of members in both Houses on recomittal of the Constitution Bill; but last session the hon. member said he was against degrading the two Houses for some years; that he wished to see the Legislative Assembly with 50 members for some years and the Upper House unaltered, and the Parliament of Western Australia strong, determined, and weighty, because the problem of dealing with the Federal Parliament had not yet arisen. Later on the hon. mem-

ber had said he was opposed to any reduction in the Lower Chamber, and that he would move in Committee that the goldfields be given two more members; and he spoke in the same way of the Upper House. Farther, when in Committee the proposal for 47 Assembly members had been struck out, the hon. member said he intended to move that the number be 50, a number which he had advocated during his election campaign, from which he had just come back with a mandate from his constituents. Yet now the hon. member asked us to follow him in his absolute and complete change of front. Now he had a notice on the paper to reduce the Assembly to 42 members and the Upper House to 21.

THE PREMIER: Those members were a versatile couple.

MR. THOMAS: It was not clear who was the leader of that party; but he would ask those two members, before throwing stones at others, to be careful to look at the *Hansard* reports for the previous session at any rate.

MR. MORAN: How often should a member change his seat?

MR. THOMAS said that he, having been returned as a democrat, supported the Government when they were democratic, receded from the Government when they adopted conservative principles, and now, when they were ultra-conservative, he sat on the front Opposition bench, where he ought to sit. He was more strongly opposed to this Bill than to the Bill of last session. Last session he thought that the Premier's proposal that the agriculturists should have 12 representatives in the Upper House out of 24 was not fair, seeing that he proposed to give the mining industry only six in that House, and it therefore appeared that the agricultural were twice as valuable as the mining interests. That was bad enough, to give the mining industry a representation of only one quarter; but this Bill would give the goldfields only six, the Metropolis six, the agriculturists 12, and the pastoralists three—a total of 27.

THE PREMIER: How could there be 12 for the agriculturists?

MR. THOMAS: The Central Province—Northam, Swan, Toodyay, York; the North Province—Cue, Geraldton, Greenough, Irwin.

**THE PREMIER:** What about the voting strength there? There were 4,994 on the goldfields, and 3,490 in the others.

**MR. THOMAS:** To give the others one and a half members each would be a perfectly fair division, although he claimed that the Northern Province was a central agricultural district. In the South Province there were Albany, Beverley, Katanning, and the Williams; in the South-West Province there were Bunbury, Collie, Forrest, Murray, Nelson, Sussex, and Wellington.

**THE PREMIER:** Bunbury, Collie, and Forrest were not agricultural districts.

**MR. THOMAS:** There were in the North-West Province, which was a pastoral district. Gascoyne, Kimberley, Pilbarra, and Roebourne.

**THE PREMIER:** Pilbarra was a gold-field district.

**MR. THOMAS:** The goldfields were infinitely better off under the old Bill than under the present Bill. According to the Federal roll there were 115,393 electors in the State, which was divided into 27 members. This worked out one member to 4,274 electors. Under the Premier's proposal, five out of nine seats had considerably under that number. He did not object so much to the agriculturists getting a little more representation, nor did he think the goldfields members would object, but we objected to their getting a preponderance of the voting power for the Lower House. He failed to see why it should take three, four, five, and in some cases six voters on the Eastern Goldfields to equal one voter in the agricultural districts of the State. The Premier carefully pointed out, in thorough keeping with the remarks he made last session, that the Upper House was to represent interests, it was not meant to represent population. It was necessary to point out to the Premier that if that had to be taken into consideration, the mining industry was worth more than half as much again to the State as the agricultural industry, and was worth infinitely more to the State than Perth and Fremantle, where there were no industries or interests to represent. Perth and Fremantle lived entirely upon the mining industry and the pastoral and agricultural industries. Had it not been that these industries had gone up, Perth would

still be the same as in the early days of the original Swan Settlement. The development of mining first tended to develop agriculture, and then the two backed up by the pastoral industry built up the interests and vested interests of Perth and Fremantle; therefore it could not be stated that Perth and Fremantle, because of their big population, were entitled to more representation. Perth and Fremantle could not claim to be entitled to anything like the same representation as the mining industry, which allowed the agricultural industry to flourish as it had done during the past two or three years. He intended later on to move several amendments to the schedule. He intended to move to strike out the Central Province altogether and then to delete the word "East" and make the South Province South Central, so as to couple the Central Province with the South Province; to throw into the one province Northam, Swan, Toodyay, York, Albany, Beverley, Katanning, and Williams. Then he desired to strike out "East" in the first-named province and make it the Northern Province, consisting of Kanowna, Kurrajong, Menzies, and Mt. Margaret, and to strike out "East" from the South-East Province and include in it Dundas and Yilgarn, and then to bring Coolgardie, Boulder, Hannans, Brown Hill, and Ivanhoe into the one province of the Upper House and call it East. That would be a fair representation of interests if the Premier wished to carry out the principle that the Upper House should consist of interests only.

**MR. ILLINGWORTH:** What about the Murchison Goldfields?

**MR. THOMAS:** Before concluding he would ask the members of the Labour party who would not vote with him last session on this matter, to assist him, for he felt confident when he gave a few of the salient points of the Bill they would have no hesitation in voting with him on the Committee stage of the Bill, and if we were not able to get the Bill amended as we desired, to vote for throwing out the Bill on the third reading. Last session, under the scheme of the Premier, in a House of 48 members the goldfields were allotted 15 seats. This time we had heard some boast of giving two extra seats to the goldfields, yet although last session

the goldfields had 15 out of 48 seats, now they were to have 15 out of 50. Last session the goldfields had 6 members out of 24 in the Upper House, now they were to have 6 out of 27. He opposed the second reading of the Bill last session because he did not see any chance of the goldfields getting proper representation or justice meted out to them by the House as constituted. At that time the Labour members were opposed to him, but the Labour members and many other goldfields members stated that they felt satisfied in Committee they would be able to amend the Bill so as to make it satisfactory to the people who sent them to the House.

MR. HASTIE: Who said that?

MR. THOMAS: By and by he would be able to quote from the hon. member himself. After the Bill passed through Committee and reached third reading, the Premier simply moved that the Bill be read a third time, without comment; and he (Mr. Thomas) then stated that no justice had been done to the goldfields, that the Bill had gone through Committee, and had given the goldfields nothing more than when it was introduced. He then called on the Labour members to support him in throwing the Bill out on the third reading.

MR. MORAN: Would the Opposition support the hon. member now?

MR. THOMAS: The leader of the Opposition voted with him on the third reading last session, which was more than the member for West Perth or the member for the Murchison did. He called on the Labour members to support him on the third reading last session, but he was supported only by the present Minister for Lands and the member for the Moore. There were three members against 29 in the division on the third reading. The eastern goldfields and the north-east and southern goldfields, which he had the honour to represent, had infinitely better representation under the old Bill, as members would see from the figures he had given. Some members had seen fit this afternoon to find fault with the present Bill, and he asked those members, although they voted against him last session, and as far as they were concerned allowed the Bill to be sent to another place, if the Bill was not amended when it came to the third reading, to

insist on justice being done to the goldfields so that there would be in the House proper representation as far as population was concerned, and in another Chamber where interests were represented we would have proper representation because mining was the paramount industry in the State.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: It appeared that this opportunity was being taken by many members to express their views in regard to various matters in connection with their districts and the opinions they held in regard to redistribution. As a member of the select committee he would support the recommendations of that body; at the same time he wished to correct some of the statements which had been made, which would probably lead members to form different opinions from those which they at present held. A good deal had been said about the agricultural interests, and the mining industry had been pretty freely mentioned as against the agricultural industry. Looking at the question from a broad-minded standpoint, he had never on any occasion disparaged the wonderful things which gold-mining had done for the development of Western Australia. It had assisted agriculturists in reaching the position they were in to-day, and given a great impetus to all the interests of the State, particularly the agricultural interests. At the same time in the agricultural industry there were large numbers of people settling on the land, who had equal claims, with those in other parts of the State, to be considered. He hoped he would be able to show, taking into consideration the occupations of the people located on the land, that after all these people were not getting more than they were entitled to. As far as the goldfields were concerned, no doubt there was a greater number of people there than in the agricultural centres; but he had frequently said that there was not such a settled population on the goldfields as in the agricultural districts. We had received evidence of that on many occasions; great changes had taken place on gold mining centres. We remembered the fall which took place in numbers in the district which was represented by the late Mr. Vosper and which was now represented by the member for Kanowna. At one time there were 5,300 electors in that district, and later on that number

had fallen to something like 1,300, owing to changes which had taken place and owing to the removal of miners from one centre to another. Ultimately that district came into prominence again owing to discoveries which were made. This showed that goldfields people moved about and were not settled in the same way as people engaged in agricultural and pastoral pursuits were. The member for Kanowna the other night stated that there had not been as rapid an increase in the agricultural industry as in the mining industry, that was in proportion. He (Mr. Piesse) said he would show later that the proportion had been greater, and he had taken the precaution to provide figures on this occasion. Taking the 15 goldfields districts the number of electors on the present roll—the roll made up by the Federal authorities—was 46,188, the number on the old roll 41,308, so there was an increase of 4,880. There was actually upon the rolls an increase of 8,138, but there was a decrease on some of the rolls of 3,258, thus leaving a net gain of 4,880. On the agricultural rolls, taking 12 districts we had 15,752 or an increase of 3,877. The proportion of gain regarding the goldfields had been 11½ per cent., and regarding the agricultural districts 31 per cent. The total mining gain had been 4,880, and the total agricultural gain 3,877, the difference between the two numbers being 1,003 in favour of the goldfields, but taking the proportion the figures were very much in favour of the agriculturists. He did not say they were glad to see a smaller number of people going on the goldfields. He would only be too pleased to see a very much larger number going there; but to say that the agriculturists were not increasing was to lead this House to believe that which could not be supported. There was a better proof than that in regard to the great advance the country had made recently in connection with agriculture, and that was in reference to the rural applications. About 80 per cent. of these applications referred to the districts which had been so much spoken of to-night—districts in the southern portion of the State. There had been an almost phenomenal increase in agricultural settlement there. For the month of May, 1902, the number of rural applications was 326; in May,

1903, 665; in June of the same year 708, in July 988, and from the 1st August to the 26th over 800. So members would see that from May, 1902, to July of this year, which was a little over 15 months, the increase had been 200 per cent. Admitting that only one half of these applications meant individual settlement, it meant that settlement was going on upon the agricultural lands of the State at the rate of 400 per month, so members could understand that, although we saw such a phenomenal increase in the settlement of our goldfields in the early times of our prosperity, we saw an equally phenomenal success now in regard to numbers, proportionately, upon our rural land. We did not wish to set one industry off against another, but to give fair play to all. It was expected that by next month we should have about a thousand rural applications.

MR. MORAN: The increase in population in Perth was three times as big as that in the country referred to by the hon. member.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: It was not three times as great. According to the census roll the total gain in the State was 13,737. The gain in mining was 4,880, and that in agriculture 3,877, or a total, in round numbers, of 8,750. This left 5,000 for the remainder of the State. That was not only Perth, but Fremantle, Bunbury, Albany, Geraldton, and other places. There had been a very much greater increase, proportionately, in agriculture than in any other industry in the State or in any other centre; even greater than in Perth.

MR. MORAN: Nonsense.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: Proportionately, he meant. The hon. member talked about the conservatism of the present party. After all, however, those who were to-day acting in the interests of the State were, he took it, dealing justly with every section of the community, and were not particularly singling out any one section. The member for the Murchison (Mr. Nanson) said that justice had not been done to the Northern Districts. It had been recognised by this House for a long time that the two Kimberleys would have to be amalgamated. Even in the days of the old régime that was decided upon, but the decision was

altered in this House rather suddenly, the number of members of the Assembly being increased to 50 and a member being given back to one of the Kimberleys. It was, however, always understood that one representative would be sufficient for that district. When we came to the district the hon. member represented there had not been a very great change, but decidedly there was one member short. There had, however, been no increase in the southern districts, the number remaining as before, but Plantagenet had been abolished, and it was proposed that a portion of it should go to Albany and a portion to a new district to be established in the Southern District. He thought everyone admitted that the South had claims for an additional district. The Southern District was not having an increase of representation.

MR. NANSON: Two were abolished in the northern part.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: In the Murchison electorate there were 714 electors, in Greenough 834, Irwin 502, Moore 805, or a total of 2,855. Under the new proposals we had one electorate less. Greenough, Irwin, and the Murchison still remained.

MR. NANSON: Murchison was another district altogether; it was a mining district.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: We had the two districts. Taking the population basis, there were 2,855 electors, whereas in the district which had been formed by the change that had taken place there were 4,701 in the Southern District, so there was really a difference of 2,000 in favour of what might be termed the South-Eastern District. They were not asking for farther representation, but only the representation enjoyed in the past. We were doing away with one district and dividing another, making two where the population had increased so much that separate representation was deserved. In his opinion the member for the Murchison (Mr. Nanson) should have had a member for the North, and, as he had said on a previous occasion, one of the two members added should have been given to the agricultural centres and not to the outlying districts to which that member was given. With regard to the provinces, there were good

arguments for the division of the province referred to into two provinces, and that division was fully justified.

MR. TAYLOR: When speaking on this particular province in the early part of the debate, he used arguments pointing out the incapacity of the committee to deal with this Bill, and he instanced a district with which he was thoroughly acquainted—Mount Margaret and the northern portion of the goldfields. As soon as he resumed his seat the Premier got up and accused him of looking after the town pump. He (Mr. Taylor) was justified in using the arguments he brought forward. Any stick was good enough to beat a dog with, and metaphorically speaking the Premier was the dog this time, and after firing his shots he cleared to the Refreshment Room, where the air was more congenial. That was a characteristic of the hon. gentleman ever since he had been in Parliament. While not objecting to divide the Mount Margaret electorate, which had a voting power of over 6,000, he must oppose the manner of doing it. The removal of Kookynie and Yundamindera from the Menzies electorate was being done with the object of securing the electorate for the Minister for Mines; but he objected to any Government bringing down a Redistribution of Seats Bill to secure their members. The division of the Mount Margaret electorate was all on the north-west side, where the heavy voting power lay. It would be a more accurate division to leave Mount Margaret as at present, and to divide it into two without taking in any portion of the Menzies electorate for saving the Minister for Mines from defeat. The Government would have their majority in the passage of the Bill because the direct Opposition were now strongly supporting the Government.

MR. PRIGOTT: That was probably why the Opposition succeeded in altering the Bill so much.

MR. MORAN: For the worse.

MR. TAYLOR: The select committee was purely a Government committee, and all the speeches delivered by the members of the committee should have been delivered from the back Government benches. The Labour party had realised, as he had anticipated for a considerable time, that their support of the Government was not in the best interests of the

democratic element of the State. The Labour members were now opposing the Government on this measure, and the direct Opposition had nullified the power of the Labour party. (Opposition laughter.) If the Labour party removed from the Government side of the House they would drive the tory element to that side, its proper place. It was idle for the Government to say that the democrats' side of the House was on the right of the Speaker. Very few people knew the reason why the name of Kurrajong had been applied to the new electorate. Kurrajong was only a tree with a hotel, and was quite a recent place.

MR. NANSON: The tree suggested "climbing down."

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: That showed all the hon. member's knowledge of the tree.

MR. TAYLOR: The member for Boulder (Hon. J. M. Hopkins) last year was the strongest opponent to the Government on this Bill, but this session, since he had become a Minister, he was conspicuous by his absence during the debates on the Constitution Bill and the Redistribution of Seats Bill. Perhaps it would be very hard for him to reconcile the position he held last year with his present position. It seemed to be the natural order of affairs that members of the present Government should be absent when anything was being debated which reflected on their statements of the past. There were plenty of places after which this new electorate could be named, such as Leonora, Malcolm, Darlôt, Sir Samuel, and last but not least Lawlers, a portion of the electorate that had been opened up far more than any other. It was named after Lawler, who discovered it. There was another man, Bob McKenzie, who travelled simultaneously with Bayley over the country, and who had been until about 18 months ago prospecting it, perishing at last in the bush. He had done more than anyone else in the State to open up gold mining. There were other names which would be much more suitable than Kurrajong, and no names more deserving than those two he had mentioned. Kurrajong was not a tree peculiar to Western Australia. It was known throughout the length and breadth of the Commonwealth. He would be

only too happy to assist in appointing a fresh select committee.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: It was questionable whether one ought to notice the last speaker's remarks, as we were discussing the first schedule, which dealt with provinces and not with Assembly electorates; yet the last speaker referred to an Assembly electorate, and another member referred to the Midland railway. In regard to the Assembly seats, the only conversation he (the Minister) had with other members was with the member for Mount Margaret (Mr. Taylor) and the member for Kanowna (Mr. Hastie), in view of which it came with bad grace from the member for Mount Margaret to say that certain things had been done by the select committee to secure his (the Minister's) seat. He was always prepared to trust himself to any part of his constituency, and he could go to many parts of the hon. member's constituency and get better support than would be given the hon. member. In the Bill as drafted, the Menzies electorate was not altered. When the Bill was referred to a select committee, the members for Kanowna and Mount Margaret met him in the Chamber and discussed the propriety of providing two members for the Mount Margaret district and two for Kanowna and Menzies joined together. That was the only conversation he had with any members of this House as to these constituencies. The hon. member's remarks were quite uncalled for, and had it not been for the manner in which he spoke, the Premier would have told him that it was intended to make the representation more equitable for each of the two districts mentioned.

MR. TAYLOR: The select committee did not take the evidence of anyone who knew the country.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: Those who took part in the conversation agreed then to a great extent. [MR. TAYLOR: No.] Let us discuss the question of provinces. By the proposal in the first schedule, the goldfields would have nine representatives in the Upper House. The East Province was essentially a goldfields province; the North Province had a predominating vote; and of the South-East Province the same might be said. There would be nine farmers' representatives,

six metropolitan and three pastoral. As the Upper House represented interests rather than population, that representation was fair.

MR. TAYLOR: But the Minister was not satisfied with it when a private member.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES said he had advocated an Upper House of 24 members; but this House advocated 27, and in an Upper House of 27 the proposed representation would be fair. On a population basis, taking the Assembly rolls as a guide, in the metropolitan district there was one province for 21,500 voters, for the goldfields one province for every 15,400 voters, including the North Province amongst the goldfields provinces. Consider also the influence which would be given by placing the Black Range and Mount Magnet in the Murchison electoral district; for it was reasonable that the interests of those larger districts should predominate. Worked out on this basis, the goldfields would have 4,900 voters per member, while the agricultural districts would have 3,490.

MR. HASTIE: Not on the Upper House rolls.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: Of course not. But a larger proportion of Assembly electors might vote for the Upper House if they desired. Remembering that the great portion of the population was in the metropolitan area and would be represented by only six members, goldfields members should be satisfied. The member for Mount Margaret was dissatisfied as to the districts. Leave that to be discussed on the second schedule, when any injustice could be easily amended.

MR. MORAN appealed to his fellow members for Perth constituencies, for he desired justice to be done to this which ought to be the most liberal and enlightened part of the State. If Perth people were not to be trusted to do justice to the State in general, he was a bad judge of humanity. Perth lived on the prosperity of the whole country. It was the centre, within hearing of the parliamentary debates. It had the benefit of a Press second to none in the Commonwealth. As representing a portion of Perth, he appealed to other metropolitan representatives that it was time to put in a word. The member for the Williams

had talked about the population his district might have, and said Perth electors could not subsist were it not for miners and agriculturists. Undoubtedly they could not, and they knew it. Therefore the State should trust the Perth people to do justice to all; for knowing the value of every industry in the State, they were not likely to do injustice to any. A few nights ago, speaking in the town hall at a valedictory assembly, he (Mr. Moran) referred to the unsatisfactory state of parties in this House, and said he would be glad to do anything which would disclose the real state of affairs in the House. To-night he and the member for Mount Margaret had disclosed what he pointed out on that occasion and hinted at early this evening. The reply to this attack on the Government came from the point from which he had predicted it would come—the Premier lay back and smiled whilst his first line of defence, the front Opposition bench, attacked the common enemy. But he (Mr. Moran) reminded his old friends now sitting in direct Opposition, for whom he had the greatest regard, that history was full of similar examples. We often read of a stronger force conquering a citadel by means which need not be specified, and afterwards forcing the conquered to take the front rank in battle and be shot down first. The members for Dundas (Mr. Thomas) and the Williams (Hon. F. H. Piesse) were put up to-night to receive the brunt of the fire from the Opposition cross-benches. The Premier had said it was a misfire; but the Premier was more suited to a party of "misses" than to one of politicians. We had two Houses of Parliament; one that ought to be the people's House, and the other that ought to be the property House. The member for the Williams (Hon. F. H. Piesse) was to be congratulated on securing a new electorate for a part of the country to which the population was going to come. Were we or were we not going to make an honest endeavour to give the people proper representation. The Government were endeavouring to burk that attempt. Last session the Government had attempted to bamboozle the Labour party. He had pointed that out, and asked the Labour party at the time to assist him in preventing the cutting up of a portion of

three agricultural seats, which he then christened the "Giblet Pie" electorate, but which was called in the Bill "Forrest." Yet after all that, the Labour party were still supporting the Government. Let us cut the country up into electorates as near as possible on a population basis. It was not possible to do that altogether, but why should we not try to allow the people, through this Lower Chamber, to have an equal voice. We should not let a red-herring be drawn across the trail, as the member for Dundas (Mr. Thomas) had been attempting to do. One did not see how the member for Dundas could feel happy in the position he had taken up. Why did the member for Dundas find it convenient to attack him, when he was fighting for what the hon. member now wished or pretended to be fighting for? The member for Dundas, who rose in his place and mouthed his democracy, was following the gentleman who defeated him (Mr. Moran) in Kimberley on the question of black labour *versus* white labour. That gentleman was the champion of coloured labour in the House, and he was honest and straightforward in his position. The same hon. member endeavoured to strike a blow at that principle of democracy, payment of members; he was opposed to payment of members and to a white Australia. That member was now supported by the member for Dundas. In the people's Chamber why should there not be a redistribution of seats on a population basis as near as possible? Those who believed in real reform should come together. What was the use of saying what was done last session or three or four years ago? We who believed the Bill was not a just one should be able to carry a redistribution of seats on a just basis. He was not wedded to the number of members being 42, 48, or 50, as he had told the member for Kanowna; he would vote for 50 or for 48; but what was wanted was an equal distribution. He (Mr. Moran) had said that if the Labour party were in favour of 50, he would help them so long as there was an equal distribution. He thought that 40 members were sufficient for this House; but he did not place any value on the proposal if it would stand in the way of equal redistribution. If some believed in 40, others 42, and others 50, let us go with the majority, and if we

wished to see 25 members in another Chamber, five fives, by all means have it. But there should not be a red-herring drawn across the trail; the other Chamber should be made representative of the whole State. It was absurd to cut the State into nine provinces. We ought to have an Upper House like the Federal Senate, representing the whole of this State, giving dispassionate consideration to all matters, and if need be sending questions back to the Assembly for reconsideration. When we had such a state of things, then we would have a proper Upper Chamber. It would not be wise to go the whole length of popular representation, but he wished to go a long way towards it. He would go so far as to ask his colleagues in Perth to make Perth an electorate returning five or six members, and the metropolitan area on the goldfields should have the same. The members who represented Perth should be free from the parish pump. Every member should take a wide view of the whole affairs of the State. After nine years in that House he would say that no one could lay a finger on any statement by him levelled against the agricultural industry. Although he had always represented big constituencies, first the goldfields and then Perth, he had always been a protectionist. Why should members be afraid to trust the majority? They were afraid to trust the people of Perth or Fremantle or the goldfields to do justice to the agricultural interest. He was one of the original goldfields members, but he had always fought for the agricultural interests; he did not oppose the interests of Kimberley or Katanning, or anywhere else. He knew as much of the State as anyone in the Chamber; he had travelled as much, perhaps more than anyone else in that House; he represented Perth, but if a question affecting the goldfields came up he knew all about it for he had been there. If a question affecting the agricultural interests came up, he knew all about it. He endeavoured to look at a question from a Western Australian standpoint. He would do all he could for Kimberley; he had been there. It did not follow that because he was elected for Perth he looked with a jaundiced eye on everything for Perth. He would never repre-

sent an electorate which would bind him down to represent them and them alone. In electing him, he was declared to be a fit and proper person to speak for Western Australia. He appealed to the member for Perth (Mr. Purkiss), whose every instinct was liberal, and to the member for North Perth (Dr. McWilliams) to help him to get equal redistribution. Why should not the heart of public opinion in Western Australia get fair representation? Was it a fair representation that was proposed for Perth, either regarding the Upper or the Lower House? The member for East Perth was not prepared to give Perth fair representation. He was a conservative, at the head of the conservative legions of this State. We wanted parties in this country for the sake of the State itself; a liberal and progressive party on one side, opposed by a party which distrusted the people. He wanted these parties to be well defined. We were helpless now, because in this Assembly there was no Opposition whatever; the views of the Government and the views of the gentlemen sitting on the Opposition side being on all-fours in reference to representation of the people. The member for West Kimberley (Mr. Pigott), the head of the Opposition, was the only consistent person among them. That member came into the House with certain well-defined principles, and he advocated them boldly; but what were those members in the tail of the team who were following him, and who on every possible occasion had to excuse themselves from agreeing with any single view the leader of the Opposition put forward? The member for Dundas (Mr. Thomas) believed in popular representation; and the member for the Williams (Hon. F. H. Piessé) was the incarnation of the old order of things. Why should not members work with the Labour party? If the Labour party represented more liberal ideas than any other party, he was with them. Why should we members not work together even although we did not belong to the same camp? He hoped the people of the country would at the next election call loudly for two well-defined parties, and ask members to range themselves behind two leaders. He did not care who they might be. Let the first plank in the party warfare be that of popular representation, putting the

power in the hands of the people through this Chamber.

MR. JACOBY: There were too many leaders: that was the trouble.

MR. MORAN: Undoubtedly there were, but at the present time there was only one leader in this House. That leader was on the front Treasury bench, and the hon. member was following him.

MR. THOMAS: The same accusation was levelled against the hon. member (Mr. Moran) last session.

MR. MORAN: No one in Western Australia ever mistook him for a Government supporter last session. The accusation came very badly from the member for the Swan (Mr. Jacoby), who knew that he was a loyal Oppositionist, and was loyal to the leader he then followed. That leader and himself were still sitting together, and he was only sorry that he was not following the member for the Murchison (Mr. Nanson) in the same place. We had the best Australian people in our midst, and he wanted to trust them. He wanted to give the people power in this Chamber as nearly as possible. He did not believe that all the wisdom in the world lay in the brains of the old inhabitants of Western Australia, and he did not see why they should be so jealous of newcomers to this State. Representatives of the older people in this State still sat in the Assembly and refused to give the people full representation, and it was about time that this position was brought to the front.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: The hon. member said before that progress was made during the *régime* of the Forrest Government.

MR. MORAN: To the Forrest Government he gave full and complete justice. During the ten years under Sir John Forrest we made gigantic strides in liberal legislation; but Sir John Forrest was not in power now. The party that had been called the liberal party had been in office a couple of years, but what had they done? Even if Sir John Forrest did so much for the people in those days, was it not about time the people got a chance of doing things for themselves? The majority would do justice to the minority, just the same as the minority would do justice to the majority; but the doing of justice by a minority to a majority was not popular government. He appealed to members to make this a

clear-cut issue. It was not a question of nine provinces or ten or eleven provinces for the Upper House, but a question whether we should make the Lower House a popular Chamber, and liberalise the franchise for the other House. If the Upper House opposed the public will consistently, we would discuss the problem as to who should rule, the whole mass of the people or a section of the people? That would be the cry, should the people have the power or should they be befooled to their heart's content in the same way as they had been by the present Premier? Should they be befooled the same way as they were last session? They asked for bread, and the Premier gave them a stone. They asked for redistribution, and he made firmer than ever in the hands of the few the power of this country. If we got a popular Government in this Chamber fully representing the voice of the people, that Government would be strong to resist the encroachments of Federation.

MR. JACOBY: We should have the Labour party, on those principles.

MR. MORAN: The principle he entertained was that of cutting up this State into equal electorates; and if the Labour party represented the bulk of the souls in the State, they should rule in this Lower House. The Labour party might have extreme views, but they would be honest views, publicly expressed and fought for, and we should know exactly where we were. We should have a party in power that would be true to its pledges, and we should then agree with them or fight against them. There would still be an Upper Chamber, which would be some sort of check on hasty legislation. Eight years ago when it was said that we should have Labour members in this House, he stood up in his place and fought in season and out of season in defence of the Labour party. He stated then that they had purified Australian politics at least, and that in the Eastern States since the Labour members had entered Parliament there had been less log-rolling and less expenditure of large sums of money on rotten railways. In his earliest years he was taught to believe in the power being in the hands of the people. He came from a race which knew all too much what it was to dread the rule of the aris-

tocracy, and which looked with longing to the rule by democracy. We wanted government by the people. The man working for a living on the goldfields had more to dread from harm to Western Australia than had the gilded capitalist who could get out of it if he liked. The great bulk of the people had to live in Western Australia, and they would fight for Western Australia if they were properly led. The man who was working for his daily bread wanted to see Pilbarra opened up; he wanted to see more employment, and why should he not? He would not neglect Pilbarra. The man working for his daily bread in Perth was not going to neglect Kimberley. He wanted his meat cheaper, and therefore would look after Kimberley. The man working in Perth was not going to hurt the goldfields, knowing too well that Perth depended largely on the goldfields; and the man on the goldfields was prepared to recognise that his lot was cast with that of the man in Perth, and he was not going to hurt the man in Perth or hurt the farmer. The man on the goldfields knew that if he wiped out the agricultural industry, he would double his own burden of the State's indebtedness. It was idle to say that the man who had property should rule in both Houses. It was an insult to the people of the State. The people should have at least a say in what they should pay as taxes. It was no use appealing to the member for the Williams, but he hoped the members for Dundas, Sussex, the Swan, and North Perth would join with him in the fight and not quarrel amongst themselves. His only enemy was conservatism. He did not wish to bandy words with the hon. member for Dundas. When the hon. member for Dundas looked for assistance, he would forget whom he had attacked that night and remember that they both fought side by side.

MR. DAGLISH: What about the member for South Perth?

MR. MORAN: The case of the member for South Perth was not altogether hopeless. The hon. gentleman came from a very liberal and democratic family, and if there was anything in flesh and blood he should be with the liberal party. There was popular representation in New Zealand, and the Labour party did not rule. It was the same in South Australia

and the same in New South Wales; and in those States the Labour members were found in common with other liberal and broad-minded men working for the good of the State. There should be a clear fight on this matter. The Bill should be sent back to the committee. The great question was redistribution with an equal value of votes. It was for this he voted, and he hoped to hear an expression of opinion from other members for Perth in favour of more equitable redistribution of seats. It was not too late to defeat the Government on the question, and go to the country with the cry of the people to rule or the class to rule. He did not care which.

[MR. ILLINGWORTH took the Chair.]

MR. THOMAS: The member for West Perth was under a misapprehension. He (Mr. Thomas) had not stated that he would not support the amendments of the member for West Perth, but that he would rather these amendments came from some one more befitting the occasion. He (Mr. Thomas) and the member for Boulder were often the sole opponents of the Government on the Constitution Bill last session; and it would have been better for the suggested amendments to come from either of them, and then the member for West Perth would be able to say he regretted that last session he had not seen eye-to-eye with them, but that now he had pleasure in supporting the amendments. He (Mr. Thomas) objected to the member for West Perth "playing to the gallery," as he had done for an hour or so, using the word "I" ten times more than any other word, and advertising himself with amendments against which he had voted last session.

MR. MORAN: It was untrue.

MR. THOMAS: No member had worked so hard last session in Committee as he (Mr. Thomas). He had appealed to the member for the Murchison, then leader of the Opposition, to the member for West Perth, and also the leader of the Labour party, and Mr. Moran had voted with the Government on a division to throw out the Bill as being thoroughly useless. The member for Boulder then advocated the sending of the Bill to the people, and challenged

the Government to go to the people with such a rag as the Constitution Bill. He (Mr. Thomas) then said it was time a fresh mandate was obtained from the people; but the member for West Perth, voting with the Government, refused to allow that mandate being obtained. In September, 1899, the member for West Perth moved to increase the number of members in the Upper House from 24 to 30. A division was taken, and the motion was carried by a majority of one. Right from 1899 to the end of the last session the same member was thoroughly consistent in the attitude he had taken; but practically the next speech he made, after he had been away on a holiday trip, was one entirely denouncing everything he had said in previous speeches. One could hardly follow a man of that sort; but when the hon. member moved his amendments he (Mr. Thomas) would be a staunch voter for them, though he preferred that they should come from a man who had believed in them and practised them for a few hours longer than Mr. Moran had. He (Mr. Thomas) had sat on the Government cross-benches at the beginning of last session; but when the Government did not start to carry out their promises to broaden the lines of representation, he then shifted his seat to the Opposition cross-benches; and again, because he found that the Government were still going backwards in their policy, he had shifted to the front Opposition bench. However, if the views of the leader of the Opposition were opposed to his, he would not hesitate to vote against him. He was in dead opposition to the Government. He would cast his vote against them to turn them out of office on any question, and it was because he recognised that in this question there was a chance of turning the Government out of office, he was perfectly satisfied to cast his vote in doing so. It showed how much he thought of the Government's intentions towards democratic government when he wished to turn them out of office. He was prepared to go to his constituents to show how he voted, and give reasons; but the member for West Perth had on many occasions stood up in this House and said that he must be loyal to his leader and vote with him. One would back up any hon. member who moved amendments in the direc-

tion of making both Houses more representative.

MR. MORAN: The member for Dundas had persisted in making the statements that for years past he (Mr. Moran) was opposed to popular representation.

MR. THOMAS: The reference was to numbers.

MR. MORAN: In a fight of this kind he did not believe in misrepresenting any hon. member, and he was glad the hon. member had explained; but it did not do to make a quarrel about whether the Assembly members should be 42 or 50. That was dodging the main issue. He (Mr. Moran) defied anybody to say he had ever opposed popular representation; and he now advocated the recommitment of the Bill on the question of equal representation, not of numbers. If the hon. member was sincere in his opposition to the Government, he would find it unwise to attack members on his own side of the House. Surely he (Mr. Moran) had not made the slightest reference to any member of the Opposition by name.

MR. THOMAS: The hon. member had attacked the front Opposition bench.

MR. MORAN: In leaving the House to-night he had said to another member sitting on the Opposition cross-benches, "The attack upon us is preconcerted; it is coming from the direct Opposition benches;" and he had said that those Opposition members who were in sympathy with the Government were greatly mistaken in allowing themselves to be made the Government catpaw to attack other members in Opposition.

MR. PIGOTT: Much had been said as to the *personnel* of the select committee whose report was now before us, and many of the remarks of members, and of Opposition members particularly, were to a great extent unjustified and exceedingly unfair. Members on the front Opposition bench had been accused of leaguings with the Government. That accusation had been made ever since he became leader of the Opposition, and had come first from members of the Labour party the very night he took his seat as leader. The Labour party maintained that there was a compact between the Government and the Opposition. This the Premier had not thought fit to deny; and even to-night,

though he (Mr. Pigott) denied it, he felt he might be giving away his power by so doing. His career in the House had been straightforward, and he did not fear to go at any time to his constituents. He had not thrown away the power placed in his hands; but the Labour party had not only thrown away their party rights, but had degraded themselves in the eyes of the whole community. When they came into the House there was a minority Government; and they made terms with that Government to keep it in power on condition that certain measures were introduced. That policy continued until the defeat of the Leake Ministry. Then the member for the Williams (Hon. F. H. Piessé) tried to form a Ministry. The member for Coolgardie (Mr. Morgans) formed one, but could not get the support of the Labour party. In this State at any rate the Labour party should have been always independent; but by throwing in their lot with the Leake and the James Ministries they had condemned themselves, as was proved by the fact that we had now a true Opposition to the Government, while the Labour party said "We have now finished with the James Government; we wish to turn them out, and the Opposition will not allow us to do so." [MR. F. REID: What about the votes?] He in particular was doing his duty to the State in using every means in his power to keep the Labour party in their present position. Shortly he would claim the vote of the Labour party to turn out the present Government, and it would be seen whether the party would act consistently with their opinions. Did he not vote twice against the Government, and how did the Labour party vote then? They said in effect that they could not afford to turn out the James Government. He had always maintained that there should be a dissolution, provided the Ministry could be turned out of power. It was on this question that we should have a dissolution. He would make clear to the country the true position of parties in the House. The Labour party should have remained independent. He contended they had not wished for a dissolution; but if they had, they should have turned out the Government and got a dissolution. It did not lie in their mouths to say they would not turn out the James

Government because a worse would go in. Opposition members never asked for the support of the Labour party, and so long as he was leader that support would never be asked for.

MR. DAGLISH : The hon. member had just said he would claim it.

MR. PIGOTT : The vote of the Labour party to turn the Ministry out of power he would claim ; but he wanted the vote for that purpose only and for nothing else. A time would come when a new Labour party in the House would follow him, because the country would understand that it would get fairer treatment from him, who would enter into no bargain, than from a Government like the present, which made pledges and broke them, to the injury of the country. The members for West Perth (Mr. Moran) and Murchison (Mr. Nanson) had joined in this bitter cry, saying " Why should Opposition members support the Government ? " They knew well that the members on the direct Opposition benches had always opposed the Government tooth and nail.

MR. MORAN : Principles were spoken of ; never mind the Government.

MR. PIGOTT : The hon. member accused him of supporting the present Bill. The Bill had been amended as he suggested in his speech on the second reading. [MR. MORAN : Just so.] If the Government had stuck to the principle of their Bill, they would have resigned. [MR. MORAN : It was a joint Bill.] It was nothing of the kind. He (Mr. Pigott) treated the Bill last year as he treated it this session, saying that the time was not ripe for redistribution, and that he did not believe that the people wanted it. He had been through the goldfields and the southern districts, and had heard nothing of this cry for redistribution. The member for West Perth (Mr. Moran) said recently in an after-dinner speech that he was not satisfied with the position of parties here. Was it natural that he should be satisfied ? Had he not sat in every corner of the House, with the Labour party, with the Forrest Government ?

MR. MORAN : When with the Labour party ?

MR. PIGOTT : When first in the House.

MR. MORAN : There was no Labour party then except himself.

MR. PIGOTT : True ; the hon. member was then the Labour party. Had he not sat on the Ministerial benches, and with the direct Opposition ? And could he claim that in any position he had received the support of the House ? It was only natural he should be disappointed, and should demand that he (Mr. Pigott) should not lead the Opposition. The hon. member said the Government should be turned out at all hazards. But what did he do ? As soon as he saw the Opposition growing in power he withdrew his support.

MR. MORAN : None too soon, either.

MR. PIGOTT : When the hon. member knew a motion of no-confidence was coming against the Government, he withdrew his support.

MR. MORAN : Why move a vote of no-confidence against the Government ?

MR. PIGOTT : If he put a motion of want-of-confidence before the House, he would do so to have a dissolution.

MR. MORAN : The hon. member would not take office.

MR. PIGOTT : Not with the present Parliament ; no. He thought he had made his position clear, and there was no occasion for him to go farther. Going back to the schedule, as a member of the select committee he intended to support it, and he hoped it would be supported by members generally. It had been agreed that there should be 27 members in the Upper House and 50 in the Lower House.

MR. STONE moved that progress be reported.

Motion put and negatived

MR. DAGLISH : It was not possible to know what had moved the leader of the Opposition, but he (Mr. Daglish) had succeeded in moving him. The hon. member the other night made a charge of corruption against members, and declined to specify what particular members he accused. The hon. member had again distinguished himself by making an incorrect charge, and he ran away from it as he ran away from the charge he made a few nights ago. The mere fact that the member had already made a charge and refused to substantiate it, a charge which rebounded against him from fear to substantiate, was a complete

answer to anything which he might say to-night or in the future. As a member of the Labour party, one would never dream of casting a vote against the existing Government on a motion of no-confidence moved by the member for West Kimberley. He did not think the member was qualified and fit to lead the Opposition, much less to lead the Government. It was an absolute disgrace for a gentleman possessed of his capacity and his opinions to occupy such a position in Western Australian politics. He had stood up and openly advocated the claims of absentee Chinamen against Western Australia; which required nothing more to be said against it than his having done so.

MR. MORAN : The member had a large party behind him.

MR. DAGLISH : Large in corporation if large in no other way. That party he ventured to say was not prepared to follow the leader of the Opposition on questions of principle, but would follow him in an attack on the Treasury bench if successfully made. The objection raised to the Opposition was that there was no line of principle on which they could be relied to take a stand. They were not separated from members on the Treasury bench on questions of principle : it was all a question of office with them. He was willing to admit that the Opposition would jump the Treasury bench if they had a chance; but there was no vote on a question of principle—it was all a question of “outs” against “ins.” The hon. member complained because the Labour party would not act as the cat-spaw of the Opposition. The hon. member would always have cause to complain on the same ground. The Labour party would vote with the Government or against the Government, as occasion required them to do. The Labour party were prepared to vote with the Government if they took up a good principle, and would vote against them if they took up a bad one. The Labour party voted independently of the question of “ins” or “outs”—they settled the matter on a question of principle. The member for West Perth asked for a cleavage of parties. He (Mr. Daglish) had also asked for that before in the House. We could not get pure government until we got a line

of cleavage established. Until then, we could not get a proper execution of the will of the people in the Chamber. He hoped we were coming to the time, and that early, when there would be some distinct line of demarkation between the parties, and not merely a separation by the gangway. There was no question of principle at all involved in where members sat. We saw this to-night; we had it in the remarks made by the leader of the Opposition and by his lieutenant the member for Dundas, speaking entirely from different standpoints. We had a third voice from the Opposition in the member for the Williams, different from the other two. The time had come for a clear line of principle between parties. On this question of representation in the Legislative Council we were unable in the Assembly to get a clear issue. He entirely disagreed with the first schedule of the Bill. He did not know why the Metropolitan-Suburban Province should have been selected to be wiped out. It would be one of the most populous provinces of the Legislative Council, and every electorate embraced in it was a growing electorate. It had within its area the most rapidly increasing districts of the State, not excepting the Williams district. One constituency alone within that Metropolitan-Suburban Province showed one-fifth of the increase recorded since the last census was taken; yet that province, which in population had rushed ahead by leaps and bounds, was the one selected in the ten existing provinces to be wiped out for the benefit of the Williams district. And that same favoured agricultural district, besides getting an additional representative in the Council, was selected for an additional representative in the Assembly. He was willing to support a membership of 50 for the Assembly, or support any number so long as the membership was equal. He agreed with the member for West Perth that 42 members were ample if equitably distributed; but what chance was there of getting an equitable distribution of seats? The trouble was that if we had 42 members we would find the agricultural party able to secure just as big a numerical strength as with a representation of 20. He (Mr. Daglish) was aiming at getting for the people of this State as much representation in the

people's House as possible; for while we had two Houses, there ought to be in one House nothing but population considered. People in the populous centres were entitled to excessive representation if anything, more than the people of the back country, for the reason that the people in populous centres were thoroughly educated on all questions coming before Parliament, and were thoroughly able to express or to criticise opinions, having the latest political knowledge to guide them. It was in these centres that one found political interest most keen. He contended that everywhere throughout Australia the most conservative representatives in Parliament came from country districts.

MR. JACOBY: There was nothing criminal in being conservative.

MR. DAGLISH was only pointing out the fact. There was nothing criminal in being as conservative in principle as the member for the Swan. Throughout the length and breadth of Australia, country members invariably were the most behind the time in political matters in any House of Parliament.

MR. JACOBY: They were matter-of-fact.

MR. DAGLISH: They were matter-of-fact. If the member for the Swan required a testimonial, no doubt he was willing to write it and guarantee its truth. Everyone did not see the member for the Swan as he saw himself, but some people saw him better. As to the Metropolitan-Suburban Province, he intended to vote against the scheme in the schedule on the ground that this province was entitled to be retained in the Bill far before the Central Province which represented six thousand odd Assembly electors, and before the North-West Province which represented 2,405 electors, or the South Province which represented 6,286 electors, or the North Province which represented 8,000 electors, or the South-West Province with 10,000. He contended that as in this House there were representatives of property, we should have to some degree representatives of property in the other Chamber. If the Premier saw his way to grant representation to population alone in the Assembly, certainly he would be willing to support a proposal to give some extra representation to property in another place; but while the system of

representing interests prevailed in the Assembly, undue prominence was given in the country districts in the first schedule of the Bill.

MR. HASTIE: It was not anticipated when he moved that the schedule be referred back to the committee that members would go into details of the whole subject; but he specially invited their attention to the matter of the provinces, to see how they could be distributed. The whole thing seemed to have been forgotten. Few members had confined their remarks to the provinces; therefore it was difficult to know whether the Committee had benefited much by the discussion, because the central parts in the distribution of seats for the Lower House had never yet been considered. The first schedule was confined entirely to the Upper House, and the Assembly was confined to the second schedule. A matter which had been just mentioned by the member for Subiaco (Mr. Daglish) seemed to him to be of very great importance. The position was that at the present moment we had 10 provinces which returned members to the Upper House. Of that 10 the Metropolitan District had three, one being Perth, another Fremantle, and the third the Metropolitan-Suburban. Now we were asked to strike out altogether one of those provinces and reduce the metropolitan representation from nine members to six. He would remind the Committee that this schedule was not a Government matter, but it had been done by a committee appointed by the House by ballot. He was a member of that committee. This was the recommendation of the committee, but it was within the province of the House to say whether that report would be adopted or not. To him it was so very unsatisfactory in some respects that we might strongly recommend the House to reconsider it, and in his opinion the only possible way was by remitting it to a committee, as it was absurd to suppose the House would do it "on its own." He would like the committee not to be the present one, but a new committee. [Interjection by Mr. MORAN.] Every member of the House, including the member for West Perth (Mr. Moran), had said that we could not decide on an entirely equal population basis.

MR. MORAN: We could do it in the Upper Chamber. We had a property House. He was in favour of having these nine provinces on an entirely population basis, upon the Upper House roll.

MR. HASTIE: That was new to him, and he very much doubted the possibility of its being done, even though it was proposed by the member for West Perth. The position we had all taken up was that population should be the most material factor.

MR. MORAN: In some other House. He would rather have it here.

MR. HASTIE: Mr. Harper had been written to by him asking whether one could move that the schedule should be referred to a select committee with a view to a more equitable redistribution of seats.

THE CHAIRMAN: That could not be moved in Committee.

THE PREMIER: Let the hon. member move to add to the Central Province certain other districts.

MR. HASTIE: The amendments foreshadowed by the member for Dundas (Mr. Thomas) were such as would have met his ideas on the subject. He thought there could first be a general discussion, and if the House would not agree to send the matter back to a committee, we might follow the lines indicated by the member for Dundas.

THE CHAIRMAN: To do that it would be desirable to move to report progress, and let the Speaker be in the Chair. What was suggested could not be done in Committee.

MR. HASTIE: Then in a few minutes he would propose that, and test the question. But before he did so would the Committee bear with him whilst he made an explanation on a matter which had been before the House. He regretted very much that personalities and insinuations had been used by one or two members. With reference to the division of Menzies and Mount Margaret, he wished to explain exactly what took place. He regretted that the member for Mount Margaret (Mr. Taylor) was not present, or he should have pointed out that the committee asked no member whatever to come and give evidence before it. When members of the select committee did not know definitely what difference would be made

by altering the boundaries, they consulted members and tried to get information everywhere they could. As regarded the district of Menzies, and also that of Mount Margaret, the committee were in this position, that they had altered certain boundaries and found Mount Margaret with an electoral roll of 5,800, and Menzies with an electoral roll of 4,200—altogether 9,500. It appeared to the committee that the best and fairest way of dealing with the matter was to make three members represent a district containing 9,500. He promised that he would try and get the best information for the committee, as he was best acquainted with the goldfields. He then saw the member for Mount Margaret and the member for Menzies together. They talked the matter over. One suggested that the best way in the first place was to take Kookynie out of Menzies. The member for Mount Margaret suggested that himself. The member for Menzies also suggested it.

MR. TAYLOR: The member for Mount Margaret never suggested anything of the kind.

MR. HASTIE repeated that the member for Mount Margaret made the suggestion to him. However, the original suggestion did not much matter, because shortly after that the committee had a map. He (Mr. Hastie) was present between the two, and as far as he could see it was mutually agreeable to both gentlemen that a line should be drawn before Kookynie. At any rate the member for Mount Margaret raised no objection and the member for Menzies raised no objection.

MR. TAYLOR: Did not he (Mr. Taylor) say that it would not act at all?

MR. HASTIE: The member for Mount Margaret did not tell him anything of the kind. By striking off Kookynie the position they were in was this, that Menzies would be left with a population of somewhere about 3,000, and the new district, that was, the present district of Mount Margaret with the addition of Kookynie, would have a population of somewhere about 6,000.

MR. TAYLOR: It had 6,000 now.

MR. HASTIE: It had not.

MR. TAYLOR: It had 6,000 at present.

MR. HASTIE: It had 5,300.

MR. TAYLOR: Let the hon. member read the statistics.

MR. HASTIE: Mount Margaret with Kookynie had about 6,000. Then the committee wished to divide it. The committee had with them the Surveyor General, and they asked him to put in as fair boundaries as he possibly could. The Surveyor General then drew a line leaving Kookynie in with Leonora, Lawlers, and other places. He (Mr. Hastie) pointed out that this would leave a small population on one side and a big population on the other. The Surveyor General said he did not know, but he would leave it that way. Before the committee definitely decided, they practically arranged this boundary with an understanding that it would be altered. Since that time he had seen the member for Mount Margaret and the member for Menzies, and both said that these were unfair divisions. The Premier, on that being pointed out, also agreed that an amendment should be made, by which both districts would have an equal representation. He could assure members that all this was brought forward naturally, and members need not attribute ulterior motives to anyone. Whatever ulterior motives either the member for Menzies (Hon. H. Gregory) or the member for Mount Margaret had, the select committee had none in the matter, and no member of the committee considered for a moment what party any division would represent. The member for Mount Margaret could again be informed that the select committee had acted as honestly as they possibly could. That explanation was necessary, because it was only due to the member for Menzies, who had been most meanly and cowardly attacked.

MR. NANSON moved that progress be reported, so that the member for Kanowna might move the Speaker into the Chair to discuss whether the schedule could be sent back to the select committee.

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

Ayes	...	...	...	12
Noes	...	...	...	22
				—
Majority against	...	...	...	10

AYES.

Mr. Bath  
Mr. Daglish  
Mr. Hastie  
Mr. Johnson  
Mr. Mornn  
Mr. Nanson  
Mr. Purkiss  
Mr. Reid  
Mr. Stone  
Mr. Taylor  
Mr. Thomas  
Mr. Wallace (Teller).

NOES.

Mr. Burges  
Mr. Butcher  
Mr. Diamond  
Mr. Ferguson  
Mr. Foulkes  
Mr. Gardiner  
Mr. Gordon  
Mr. Gregory  
Mr. Hassell  
Mr. Hayward  
Mr. Hutchinson  
Mr. Jacoby  
Mr. James  
Mr. Morgans  
Mr. Oats  
Mr. Phillips  
Mr. Piesse  
Mr. Pigott  
Mr. Rason  
Mr. Smith  
Mr. Yalverton  
Mr. Higham (Teller).

Motion thus negatived.

MR. MORAN: The division was a very fair index of the real position of the Chamber, and the Premier had reason to congratulate himself that he had a great majority to support him in robbing the people of fair representation; and that support was not all on the Government side of the House. There was no harm in the country seeing this division list. It might be that the division would represent the position of the Government when they came back from the country next time; and should that be the case, he would welcome with much delight the day when we should see this division representing a solid party in the country. Then the fight would be started. [CHAIRMAN: Question.] He had no desire to stonewall the Bill. The stand taken by him was simply to protest against the anomaly of two property Houses. He was glad he had provoked the debate, because it led to the expression of opinion from many parts of the House which cleared the atmosphere considerably. The leader of the Opposition had said he was keeping the Government in power by preventing the Labour party defeating them.

MR. PIGOTT. Nothing of the kind. The hon. member should withdraw those words.

MR. MORAN: The House had heard the remark.

MR. PIGOTT denied absolutely using the words, and asked for the protection of the Chair.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member had denied using the words, and Mr. Moran should withdraw them.

MR. MORAN: The matter could be left to the House and to the persons who

reported the member for West Kimberley. We should have a proper cleavage on this question. His support would be given to any amendment which went to make representation in the Upper House equal, and to do the best that could be done with the nine provinces. He would support any amendment to liberalise the schedule.

**MR. HASTIE :** If an amendment were made in the second line of the schedule, could we reconsider the first line ?

**THE PREMIER :** Yes. The Government would agree to recommit if the amendment were carried.

**MR. HASTIE** moved as an amendment—

That the words "Albany, Beverley, Kataning, and Williams" be added to the second line.

The amendment would add the proposed South Province to the proposed Central Province, and according to the rolls the total number of electors for the new province would be 12,886. At present Northam, Swan, Toodyay, and York contained only 6,600 Lower House electors; hence the proposed Central Province would be much smaller in numbers than either of the two Eastern Goldfields provinces, about one-third of either of the metropolitan provinces, and a little more than half of the South-Western. It was impossible to have Upper House representation on a population basis; but the amendment would give a result nearly approaching that. Part of the districts proposed to be amalgamated was quite close to Perth, and the farthest part was at Northam. The districts were all connected by rail with the capital, so that their representatives would have every facility for coming here.

**MR. NANSON :** There was said to be a soul of goodness in things evil; but was there in this schedule ? One might look through it without discovering anything satisfactory, and particularly did it show strong distrust of the popular voice. Those who said we must scout the idea of representation on a population basis only used a form of words to conceal their secret belief that the electors as a whole should not be regarded as possessing any great wisdom, and that wisdom resided in the minority. When the redistribution was first proposed the necessity for compromises was admitted ;

and last session a fairly reasonable compromise was arrived at. To-night the member for Dundas accused him (Mr. Nanson) of inconsistency because he had described the Bill of last session as essentially a non-party measure and a measure of compromise, and had supported it to that extent. He had thought the Bill of last session perhaps the most satisfactory that could be devised, considering the divergent elements in the House; but this schedule showed the palest possible reflection of the Bill of last session, and we found in it traces of all the wire-pulling, all the conversations, all the weaknesses of party manœuvring and all the compromises arrived at since the compromise of last session, which went far enough. He regretted that the majority of members refused to allow progress to be reported so that the schedule might be sent back to the select committee, to whom it did no credit, with instructions to try to frame a schedule which should more accurately reflect popular opinion. Whether regarded from the point of view of representation on a population basis or of representation of interests, the schedule was a failure, and inconsistent. As to agriculture as a whole, it affirmed the opposition to representation on a population basis, but in dealing with the unfortunate northern agricultural seats, that principle was considered most admirable; and when effort was made a few minutes ago to have progress reported so as to reframe the schedule, the members for Geraldton (Mr. Hutchinson) and the Irwin (Mr. Phillips) supported this schedule, which inflicted most unheard of and dastardly injustice on the northern agricultural constituencies. Did those members believe in representation of population or in representation of interests ? Surely even now it was not too late to have a Bill which would affirm some definite principle. Personally he had always favoured representation as far as possible on a population basis, and last session he supported the destruction of his own constituency to carry out a somewhat similar proposal. Yet now he was accused of inconsistency because the Bill which was introduced last session had since been altered out of recognition. A number of seats in the Assembly and a number of provinces in

the Upper House had been altered almost beyond recognition. One should not be denied the right to oppose the measures of the Government by every means in one's power. If there was consistency in the House it would be found on the side of those who had opposed the alterations in the Bill because they dared not go too much from the alterations suggested last session. Coming to the amendment by the leader of the Labour party it was a difficult matter to know how to vote on an amendment of that kind, because the schedule was in such a form that while we might tinker at it and alter it a little bit here and a little bit there, he very much doubted, unless it was sent back to the select committee to deal with more carefully than they had dealt with it already, if the committee, unless they took a vast amount of time over the matter, would be able to lick the schedule into shape. It would have saved time if the proposal to report progress had been carried. If the Government and a majority of members were sincere in their desire to get a good schedule to the Bill, he could not see why they opposed so reasonable a suggestion. Another point suggested itself. If the proposal made by the member for West Perth earlier in the sitting that we should not go into the question of the schedule until we had first definitely decided what form the Constitution Bill should take, how many provinces there should be for the Upper House and how many districts for the Lower had been adopted, time would have been saved. If we decided that first, if the Constitution Bill was absolutely settled, the third reading passed and the recommittal stage settled, we could get on to the Bill; then we should know that finality had been reached so far as the Assembly was concerned. But through the refusal of the Government to agree to that proposal, and the other refusal of the Government and their supporters to allow the schedule to go back to the select committee, we were landed in a sea of difficulties. Nothing remained but to take the schedule line by line, and each member seek to get it amended in the way he desired. That would be a lengthy and laborious process, trying the patience of the House to the utmost. But it was

necessary that if the select committee would not do the work it should devolve on the House. In the schedule the whole of the proposals of the select committee were crystallised. There was the report of the committee, but that report did not give one solitary reason how the committee arrived at their decision. The report was silent on the point. It merely stated the decisions, leaving the House to discover what the reasons were. The Premier did make an attempt to prove why the provinces were fixed as in the schedule, but other members of the select committee did very little to enlighten the House on the point. The member for the Williams mainly occupied his time in proving the wonderful profundity of the Katanning district for population; and the leader of the Opposition threw down his pencil on the table and was annoyed because he had been hustled a little by another member of the Opposition. The leader of the Opposition dealt a great deal with the non-existence of a compact; and it appeared to hurt the hon. member's feelings that there was any idea of a compact between the Government and the direct Opposition benches. He (Mr. Nanson) never supposed the compact was under seal and writing. He did not know even that there had been negotiations between the so-called Opposition forces and the Government; but he knew there was a compact, even if the leader of the Opposition was ignorant of it. Without knowing it, the leader of the Opposition admitted that a compact existed in the very speech in which he denied it. There was a compact for the Opposition benches allying themselves with the Government so as to defeat the members on the Labour bench. That might be a reasonable compact under certain circumstances. For his part he had never hesitated, when he thought the Labour party or the Government for that matter were supporting legislation which tended to make employment scarce in the country, which tended to suppress an industry, and which tended to make it difficult to earn an honest living, to attack the Labour party or the Government when the question of introducing democratic measures or a Redistribution of Seats Bill, or to do everything in his power to prevent the suppression of the popular voice. It was

an unholy compact against the best interests of the people, when it was found that the Government and the Opposition were conspiring together to give us a schedule like that in the Bill which burked the popular voice, perpetrated an injustice, and which, instead of removing evils which we were told would be removed at the last general election a compact of that sort whether under hand or seal or only a verbal one, whether an unconscious compact, should be denounced on the floor of the House. It was for that reason that it was necessary to deal at some length with the schedule, because members felt that this schedule was the net result of all those negotiations—to give it the nicest name possible, it could be called by worse—this schedule was the result of all the negotiations and wire-pulling that had taken place between the parties, and which would be a negation of all the principles of popular government. He could not understand how members representing constituencies where popular feeling ran high—it ran high at the last general election and he had yet to learn that it had changed in the slightest—could reconcile their convictions with a schedule of this description. He trusted before the matter was finally disposed of, if we did not succeed in carrying our wishes, we at least should succeed in impressing upon the people of the country, if not upon a majority of the House, the honesty of our intentions in regard to the Redistribution of Seats Bill and an adequate representation of the popular feeling. He did not care much for defeat at the present juncture. What members who were in the majority in this House were doing was to fight against the future, but they could not fight against the future with any hope of success. They were fighting against those great social forces which were always advancing, and no effort of theirs could for any length of time keep those forces in the background. It might seem for the moment that the minority in this House was hopelessly beaten, and that the flag they had raised was drooping over their heads; but that standard would again be raised in another place, it would be raised in every constituency nearly, in every populous constituency throughout the State, and then in the

firm hands of the united people of Western Australia it would be carried perhaps not to an easy but at any rate to a certain and not very far distant victory.

MR. JOHNSON: The object of the amendment was, he took it, to get in the Central and the South Provinces something like an equal proportion of representatives to that which was proposed for the East Province. Any member who had democratic opinions of any description could do none other than vote for this amendment, because the figures already given by the member for Kanowna (Mr. Hastie) showed that one province had 19,600 electors, whilst the number in another province was about 6,000. That went to convince one that the proposed distribution of these seats was not right, and that something must be done to alter the suggestion made by the select committee. He wished to enter his protest against the recommendation of the select committee. He would support the amendment.

MR. PURKISS: At the last general election and at all the by-elections the question of representation was brought very prominently to the fore, and nearly every candidate, both in written addresses and in speeches to the electors, affirmed the principle of representation on a population basis consistent with a fair margin in respect of rural districts. Before this Bill became law he would have great pleasure in searching into those addresses which were published under the names of the candidates, so that there could be no possible misconception as to what a man said through his being reported in respect of a verbal address. One would find right along the line, as regarded both sides of this House, that the principle affirmed so far as redistribution of seats was concerned was representation on a population basis, but with a reasonable margin in respect of rural districts. What had we here? If we gave effect to the amendment, what would it amount to? Let members look for themselves at the disproportion. We had got miles away from a population basis. Two electorates, aggregating 12,800 electors, would have six members as against three for the metropolitan district with electors numbering 23,700 odd. The thing was an absolute farce; it was a perfect jumble.

It was a wide guess; and there was no principle in it at all.

MR. DAGLISH moved that progress be reported and leave asked to sit again.

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

Ayes	...	...	12
Noes	...	...	21

Majority against ... 9

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Bath	Mr. Burges
Mr. Daglish	Mr. Butcher
Mr. Hastie	Mr. Diamond
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Ferguson
Mr. Moran	Mr. Foulkes
Mr. Morgans	Mr. Gardiner
Mr. Purkiss	Mr. Gordon
Mr. Reid	Mr. Gregory
Mr. Stone	Mr. Hassell
Mr. Taylor	Mr. Hayward
Mr. Thomas	Mr. Hopkins
Mr. Wallace (Teller).	Mr. Hutchinson
	Mr. Jacoby
	Mr. James
	Mr. Oats
	Mr. Phillips
	Mr. Piesse
	Mr. Rason
	Mr. Smith
	Mr. Yelverton
	Mr. Higham (Teller).

Motion thus negatived.

MR. THOMAS: Members should agree to the amendment. Dividing the 115,393 electors of the State by 27, the quota per member was 4,274. The Central Province, as proposed by the Bill, would return one member for 2,100 electors, and the South Province one member for 2,095 electors; if the two provinces were combined they would return one member for 4,195 electors, which would be slightly less than the quota. The provinces should be amalgamated, and afterwards, on recommitment of the Constitution Bill, the number of members of the Upper House could be reduced from 27 to 24.

MR. FOULKES: The member for Kanowna had not stated what he intended to do with the province he proposed to eliminate. To whom did he propose to allot that province?

MR. THOMAS: To the Eastern Gold-fields.

MR. JOHNSON: It was not the desire of the member for Kanowna to allot the province to any other portion of the State. His idea was to move for recommitment of the Constitution Bill with a view to reducing the number of members for the Upper House, should the two provinces be combined. If the province were given to either the metropolitan or the gold-

fields districts, there would then be insufficient electors for the number of members, so that the best thing to do was to carry the amendment and, on recommitment, reduce the numbers of the Upper House.

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

Ayes	...	...	12
Noes	...	...	22

Majority against ... 10

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Bath	Mr. Burges
Mr. Daglish	Mr. Butcher
Mr. Hastie	Mr. Ferguson
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Foulkes
Mr. Moran	Mr. Gardiner
Mr. Nanson	Mr. Gordon
Mr. Purkiss	Mr. Gregory
Mr. Reid	Mr. Harper
Mr. Stone	Mr. Hassell
Mr. Taylor	Mr. Hayward
Mr. Thomas	Mr. Hopkins
Mr. Wallace (Teller).	Mr. Hutchinson
	Mr. Jacoby
	Mr. James
	Mr. Oats
	Mr. Phillips
	Mr. Piesse
	Mr. Pigott
	Mr. Rason
	Mr. Smith
	Mr. Yelverton
	Mr. Higham (Teller).

Amendment thus negatived.

MR. MORAN: The amendment he was about to move was the only alternative of those who believed that the Constitution Bill should have been recommended on its third reading, so as clearly to define the lines on which redistribution should proceed. The next province in the schedule, Metropolitan, had a population of nearly 24,000 people; yet it was coolly proposed to give those people the same representation as Northam, Swan, Toodyay, and York. He moved as an amendment:

That the words "Perth, East Perth, North Perth, West Perth" be struck out.

The member for the Williams was wrong in supposing that in the country there was a bigger proportion of Assembly electors on the Upper House roll also than there was in the towns. In the country districts families were larger than in the towns, and fewer members of those families had votes. In towns were many wage-earners who had little homes, and who were therefore entitled to be on the Council rolls. If this were true, the proposed anomaly was all the more glaring. The amendment would cut in two the Metropolitan Province, and the

agricultural seats would still have almost twice the quota of representation as compared with the metropolis. His prophecy that any attempt to interfere with the Government in burking representation either in this or the Upper House would be opposed by the direct Opposition had been fulfilled by the voting to-night. Would that we had the support of the member for Boulder (Hon. J. M. Hopkins) against this injustice which he denounced so warmly last session. The hon. member's attitude was not consistent with his subsequently joining the present Government.

**MR. THOMAS:** The amendment needed careful consideration. He moved that progress be reported.

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

Ayes	...	...	...	9
Noes	...	...	...	21
Majority against				11

**AYES.**  
 Mr. Daglish  
 Mr. Johnson  
 Mr. Moran  
 Mr. Nanson  
 Mr. Purkiss  
 Mr. Stone  
 Mr. Taylor  
 Mr. Thomas  
 Mr. Wallace (Teller).

**NOES.**  
 Mr. Burges  
 Mr. Diamond  
 Mr. Ferguson  
 Mr. Foulkes  
 Mr. Gardiner  
 Mr. Gordon  
 Mr. Gregory  
 Mr. Hassell  
 Mr. Hayward  
 Mr. Hopkins  
 Mr. Hutchinson  
 Mr. Jacoby  
 Mr. James  
 Mr. Oats  
 Mr. Phillips  
 Mr. Piesse  
 Mr. Pigott  
 Mr. Rason  
 Mr. Smith  
 Mr. Yelverton  
 Mr. Higham (Teller).

Motion thus negatived.

**MR. DAGLISH:** The Governor's Speech, in dealing with the question of the Constitution, said that it was the desire of the Government to secure more equitable representation for the people of the State, and he was supporting the amendment to the schedule because it met the object to some extent which the Government were supposed to accomplish in introducing the Bill. To a large number of people of the State living within the suburbs, the Bill meant a robbery of what representation they had. After the House increased the number of members of the Legislative Council to 27 during the passage of the Constitution Bill, it was left for the select

committee to bring up a recommendation as to the establishment of a new province. It was naturally supposed the new province would be created by giving additional representation to that part of the State where the representation was most poor. If this were done, the first schedule to his mind would be fairly satisfactory, whether the additional members were given to the goldfields or to the metropolis; but instead of being given to the largest section, the additional representation seemed to have been given to one of the smallest provinces in regard to population. The Metropolitan Province, as it was proposed to divide it under existing circumstances, had nearly four times the voting power of the Central Province or the South Province and about ten times the voting power of the North-West Province. The object of the Bill was to give more equitable representation to the various provinces. The Metropolitan-Suburban Province should have been reinstated by the select committee. The argument seemed to be that numbers were entitled to a certain amount of consideration so long as persons lived far enough from the centres of population; that men should receive some consideration if they did not live in the thickly populated districts, and that livelihood was not so much to a person who lived amongst thickly populated districts as in thinly populated districts. In the populous centres there was representation of all the interests of various parts of the State. In the Metropolitan and Metropolitan-Suburban districts there were men of all classes and descriptions having interests sitting in the Legislative Council. At the present time there were contesting a vacancy in the Metropolitan-Suburban Province two candidates, one of whom had solely Perth interests, and the other had almost entirely goldfields interests. There were other gentlemen sitting in the Legislative Council representing the Metropolitan Province, instead of being purely metropolitan members had, to a large extent, agricultural interests and old settlers' interests in Western Australia. Therefore in giving representation to its fullest extent to the metropolitan districts the Committee would not in any way be robbing the people of the agricultural provinces or the goldfields provinces, because it was

found that metropolitan members were always in touch and sympathy with the interests of those living in outlying districts. He could not understand the cry in favour of the man far away from the seat of government, or why the mere fact of distance was a potent factor in the government of the State. He did not know what right distant residence gave to anyone, or how it should increase a person's intelligence. He must enter his protest on every occasion against the man who lived in the metropolitan or suburban province being less deserving of consideration in the first place, or less worthy to exercise the full power of a voting unit in the second place. While willing, like other members who sat on the Labour benches, to recognise that one could not have a division that was mathematically equal, there could perhaps be a great deal nearer equality in the voting than was proposed in the Bill. He urged the Committee to accept the amendment now under consideration, which would to a large extent meet the purpose of the Government in introducing the measure. He was willing to believe that the Government desired to fulfil their undertaking, giving more equitable representation to the people of the State. Probably the Premier was dominated somewhat by the arguments brought forward by the member for the Williams when speaking as a member of the select committee. One did not think for a minute if the Premier was convinced of the necessity of retaining the Metropolitan-Suburban Province, and had used his arguments on the select committee, the members of that body would have withstood such arguments. The Premier overlooked the matter of the metropolitan districts in giving representation to the provinces, and now that the matter was brought forward the Premier might see his way clear to fall in with the views expressed. He did not urge that more representation should be given to the Metropolitan-Suburban Province than to any other section of the State, but he urged that men living in the metropolitan-suburban district were as fully entitled as men elsewhere to an equal share in the legislative powers of the State. He urged that the amendment moved by the member for West Perth should be accepted.

MR. PURKISS: If there were a margin of 2,000, 3,000, or 4,000, there might be some sense in it, but here we had the Central Province with 6,600 electors having three members, as against the Metropolitan District with 23,700 electors. That was giving the Central Province four times the representation the Metropolitan District had. Members in their heart of hearts must conclude that this was inequitable and unjust. However, it was obvious we were not going to get fair-play in this Chamber. Members were like "dumb driven cattle," but he thanked God there would be a Nemesis beyond this House. He could not understand how the Minister for Lands (Hon. J. M. Hopkins) had the courage to come here and vote on these various questions during the last hour, in face of some of the speeches he made and amendments of which he gave notice last session.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Not one of which bore on this question.

MR. PURKISS: The Minister for Lands was, he thought, the only man courageous enough in the House to do it.

MR. NANSON: Last session the member for Boulder (Hon. J. M. Hopkins) attacked a scheme of redistribution as set forth by the Premier which was infinitely more practicable than the present one. It was interesting to look back at the attitude of that member, and to consider his attitude to-day.

THE PREMIER: If the speech were so eloquent, why did not the hon. member quote it, like he did Gladstone's without acknowledgment?

[12 o'clock, midnight.]

MR. NANSON: When he delivered that speech, he spoke absolutely without preparation. If the hon. gentlemen knew Gladstone so well, it was only an evidence that on this question at any rate he (Mr. Nanson) enjoyed the distinguished honour of being absolutely at one with that eminent statesman. In the Speech with which Parliament was opened, it was stated that a Bill would be presented to amend the Constitution in the direction of obtaining more equitable representation. The Bill introduced last session was infinitely more liberal than the measure proposed now. Last session, he (Mr. Nanson)

admitted that it was necessary, if the Bill was to get through the House, that we should have a certain amount of compromise, and he was taken to task for his peace-making efforts by the member for Boulder. He pointed out that the Bill last session originally was brought down in a spirit of fairness and apart from party politics. This he still believed, because there was no compact between the Government and the Opposition at that time, and therefore it was necessary for the Government to bring in a Bill that partook of the nature of a compromise, and which, although it did not altogether meet the wishes of the most advanced and liberal sections in the House, at any rate gave as much as there seemed any chance of obtaining. There was in existence a compact between the Opposition and the Government.

MR. JACOBY: The hon. member knew there was not.

MR. NANSON said he was perfectly aware there was a compact.

MR. JACOBY: The hon. member was not aware. It was untrue.

THE TREASURER: It was a characteristic inaccuracy.

MR. NANSON: It was not necessary to travel over the ground again, but from the speech of the leader of the Opposition it could be seen that there was a compact. The leader of the Opposition said that he was prepared to join with the Government on every question on which he could defeat the Labour party. Sometimes the liberal party and the Labour party would unite.

MR. THOMAS: What liberal party?

MR. NANSON: The hon. gentleman was the apologist for the direct Opposition, for the advocates of Chinamen and the opponents of payment of members.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question before the Chair was that the Districts of Perth, East Perth, North Perth, and West Perth be erased from the Metropolitan Province.

MR. THOMAS: The hon. member knew that he was talking rubbish.

MR. NANSON: If the hon. member for the Swan (Mr. Jacoby) would not assert that what was said was untrue, progress would be made. It was useless, however, to deny that there was a compact. This was an unconscious compact, and ninety-nine people out of one hundred

outside the House would say that it existed.

THE TREASURER: The hon. gentlemen should settle their quarrels outside.

MR. NANSON: It was not a quarrel, but merely an interesting historical investigation. He desired to deal with the speech of the hon. member for Boulder delivered on the second reading of the Redistribution of Seats Bill last session.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must keep to the question.

MR. NANSON: The effect of the amendment must be obvious to everyone. It would give adequate expression to popular opinion. The views of the majority should be allowed to speak. He had drawn attention to the very admirable speech of the member for Boulder, who pointed out that unless adequate representation was given to population a Redistribution of Seats Bill must be a sham, a delusion, and a snare. The arguments used by the member for Boulder were so excellent that, if the House were not tired and if progress could not be reported, he would read them. The member for Boulder said last session that, when the proposals of the Premier were analysed, one would come to a different conclusion from that of the Premier, who claimed that the measure was not a bad one. The member for Boulder analysed the Bill with care and caution. He (Mr. Nanson) trusted the hon. member for Boulder would do so this year, for then he would find himself quite unwittingly in the false position that he was supporting a Bill antagonistic to all the principles he had advocated last session. The hon. member had pointed out that the Bill of last session made an unconstitutional invasion of the rights of the people.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: That was correct, and he meant it.

MR. NANSON: When a comparatively liberal measure had been introduced the member for Boulder could not find means to support it. How then could he support an infinitely more conservative measure this session? There had been a lamentable falling away in the attitude of the member for Albany (the Treasurer). The Government could hardly take pride in the schedule, though the leader of the Opposition might, for he had won a great

victory by bringing round the Government to his own reactionary views. The schedule expressed an absolute reversal of Government form on the question of redistribution, especially on the part of the Minister for Lands.

MR. THOMAS: The amendment would leave in the Metropolitan Province Balkatta, Canning, and Guildford, with a total of 10,500 electors, or 3,500 Lower House voters for each Council member, whereas the proper average was 4,274; and the amendment seriously proposed that we should strike out Perth, East Perth, North Perth, and West Perth to allow one member for every 3,500 electors.

MR. PURKISS: We could conveniently add Claremont and Subiaco, from the West Province.

MR. THOMAS: True; but it was proposed to reduce the Metropolitan Province to 10,500 electors, taking practically 1,300 electors from it to help to form another province. Such a proposal should not be agreed to without full discussion. He could only imagine that the intention of the member was, if the Committee agreed to strike out the words, to move for the insertion of one other province, or wait for the recommitment of the Bill to reinsert as a new province the electorates proposed to be struck out; therefore he (Mr. Thomas) felt compelled to oppose the amendment. At this hour of the morning one should not be called on to go into important constitutional principles, therefore he moved that progress be reported.

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

Ayes ...	...	9
Noes ...	...	20
Majority against ...		11

## AYES.

Mr. Bath  
Mr. Daglish  
Mr. Moran  
Mr. Nanson  
Mr. Purkiss  
Mr. Stone  
Mr. Taylor  
Mr. Thomas  
Mr. Wallace (Teller).

## NOES.

Mr. Burges  
Mr. Butcher  
Mr. Diamond  
Mr. Ferguson  
Mr. Foulkes  
Mr. Gardiner  
Mr. Gordon  
Mr. Gregory  
Mr. Hassell  
Mr. Hayward  
Mr. Hopkins  
Mr. Hutchinson  
Mr. Jacoby  
Mr. Phillips  
Mr. Plesse  
Mr. Pigott  
Mr. Rason  
Mr. Reid  
Mr. Yelverton  
Mr. Higham (Teller).

Motion thus negatived.

MR. MORAN: There was no earthly reason why the Government should rush the Bill through, unless they were afraid of popular feeling; but the proceedings of to-night would have the effect of drawing the attention of the country to the matter and showing in clear terms the action which the member for Boulder took last session. The Government had broken every promise it had made to the country of constitutional reform. He (Mr. Moran) thought the member for Boulder would have stood to the ground he took last session. It was not fair that the member should swallow all his convictions. If the member for Boulder had a free hand in the matter he should still adopt the tactics of last session.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Read the speech of last session. There was nothing about the Upper House in it.

MR. MORAN: The hon. member knew that an unfair advantage would not be taken. The most prominent thing in politics of last session was the attitude taken up over the Redistribution of Seats Bill, yet after stirring up the goldfields on the matter the hon. member joined the Government. What concession did the hon. member get for giving up his convictions? There was no use in trying to rush this matter through. In every other Parliament a great question like this would take weeks to discuss. Here every time there was a division the direct Government supporters and the direct Opposition members closed up their ranks.

MR. PIGOTT: The Opposition had defeated the Government continually in divisions on this Bill. The whole tone of the Bill had been altered since it was introduced.

MR. MORAN: There was an endeavour to alter the whole tone of the Bill to-night, and on every division the popular party were resisted by the direct members of the Opposition and the Government supporters, and it was easy to see that there was an affinity between the two parties. It was to be expected.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question before the House was to strike out certain words.

MR. MORAN: That was being discussed by him in the most direct form. He never expected the member for Plan-

tagenet (Mr. Hassell) to vote for representation on a purely population basis.

MR. HASSELL said he voted for a liberal measure last year, and the member for West Perth voted against it.

MR. MORAN: It was not surprising to him that the member for the Williams voted with the Government. That member was a conservative, and his policy was one of distrust of the people. The member for the Swan (Mr. Jacoby) of course was at present a creature of circumstances, and the member for Sussex (Mr. Yelverton) was the victim of surroundings. One did not think either of those gentlemen was a conservative, but their leader was, for he held convictions and had the courage to adhere to them. One wanted to know why the member for Boulder (Hon. J. M. Hopkins) was a member of the Government against which he once tried to stir up the Eastern Goldfields. That member was not too popular on the goldfields.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: The member for West Perth was very popular up there!

MR. MORAN: If he had taken up the views of the member for West Kimberley on the question of black labour, the member for West Kimberley would not have opposed him, but would have withdrawn in his favour.

MR. PIGOTT: Did the member for West Perth (Mr. Moran) oppose black labour in the North, during that fight?

MR. MORAN: That was the only fight between the hon. member and himself. If the hon. member denied that, he challenged him to prove to the contrary, and he would give him an opportunity now.

MR. PIGOTT denied the truth of that statement absolutely. The hon. member made a statement to this effect, and one would be able to turn up the telegram, "When I (Mr. Moran) was the member for Kalgoorlie, I was opposed in every way to the introduction of black labour into Western Australia; but since I have come to Broome, since I have seen the North-West, since I have seen the vast importance of this great industry, I have come to the conclusion that the industry cannot be carried on without black labour; therefore you can take my word that I will support black labour for the North-West."

MR. MORAN: That was a direct challenge. If the hon. member proved that, or produced a wire to that effect, he would resign his seat for West Perth to-morrow. The hon. member knew he was telling an untruth.

MR. THOMAS: Was the member for West Perth in order in saying the member for West Kimberley was stating what he knew to be a deliberate untruth?

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member was not in order.

MR. MORAN: One could, he believed, turn up the files of the *West Australian*, and find the reports of his speeches. Both the candidates for West Kimberley who were opposing him were strong advocates of black labour, and he would get proof from the hon. member's own electorate. The only difference between them was a question of policy. He could not adopt the hon. member's policy. The hon. member had stated that he had not the telegram. This was a very important matter. The hon. member had made a statement to which he gave an unqualified denial, and he would not rest content until the hon. member produced that telegram. He affirmed that he was an absolute white-Australia candidate throughout, and the hon. member was a black labour candidate. Getting back to the question of the Metropolitan Province, surely 10,000 electors were enough for one province comprising Perth and the vicinity. No representative of Perth was likely to do an injustice to any part of the country.

MR. JACOBY: *Vice versa*, it worked the same way, did it not?

MR. MORAN: If there could not be a popular Chamber there should be fair representation on the Upper House roll.

MR. THOMAS: Fresh arguments had been raised.

MR. HIGHAM: The hon. member should not waste time.

MR. THOMAS: The member for Fremantle should withdraw his insinuation. The amendment had been put forward sincerely. If it were carried, 10,500 voters would be taken away from the metropolitan area, leaving 13,000 electors to be provided for by a fresh province. What was wrong with the goldfields people, that from two to five of them were needed to equal one Perth elector? It was surprising to find a democratic

member like the mover (Mr. Moran) attempting to make 3,500 people in Perth equal to 6,000 on the goldfields. Withdraw the amendment; move that the coastal province be struck out and another goldfields province inserted. To give time for consideration he moved that progress be reported.

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

Ayes	...	...	...	7
Noes	...	...	...	23

Majority against ... 16

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Daglish	Mr. Bath
Mr. Moran	Mr. Burges
Mr. Nanson	Mr. Butcher
Mr. Parkies	Mr. Diamond
Mr. Stone	Mr. Ferguson
Mr. Thomas	Mr. Foulkes
Mr. Taylor (Teller).	Mr. Gardiner
	Mr. Gordon
	Mr. Gregory
	Mr. Hassell
	Mr. Hayward
	Mr. Hopkins
	Mr. Jacoby
	Mr. James
	Mr. Johnson
	Mr. Phillips
	Mr. Piesse
	Mr. Pigott
	Mr. Rason
	Mr. Reid
	Mr. Smith
	Mr. Yelverton
	Mr. Higham (Teller).

Motion thus negatived.

[1 o'clock, a.m.]

[Mr. HARPER took the Chair.]

MR. THOMAS: Apparently the argument he advanced just now was not sufficient to convince those sitting on the Government side that he was acting in all sincerity and carrying out the plan of campaign initiated by the member for Boulder and himself, and which was carried through last session, believing that the proper tactics were being adopted.

THE PREMIER: Was the member speaking to the amendment, which was that certain names should be struck out?

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must speak to the question before the Committee.

MR. THOMAS: While fully seized with the question before the Committee, for the information of the Premier he might state that last session when this matter was under discussion the member for Boulder and himself formulated a policy and carried it out to the bitter end, day after day, night after night, calling

for division after division in which the member for Boulder was the teller, and this was done when it was not possible to find one other member to support us in our contention. On a few occasions last session we had the assistance of the member for the Moore (Dr. O'Connor). If one must believe what the Premier said, that the Upper House was to represent interests only, then we should insist on those interests being equally divided. The Premier had told us that his object was to make the Upper House represent interests only. He (Mr. Thomas) was not in favour of giving the Upper House representation for interests only.

THE PREMIER: What had this shocking drivel to do with the question before the Committee? We were not on the general question; that was dealt with on the Constitution Bill. The Committee were now dealing with the point as to what number of electorates should be included in the Metropolitan Province. He hoped some effort would be made to keep to the issue.

MR. NANSON: Was the Premier entitled to call the words of another member "shocking drivel"?

MR. THOMAS: The expression was not heard by him, or he would have drawn attention to the words. Was the Premier in order in using such words?

THE CHAIRMAN: The words were not desirable.

MR. THOMAS: Since these words had been attributed to the Premier, was one in order in calling on the Premier to withdraw the remarks?

THE CHAIRMAN: They were not words that should have been used.

MR. THOMAS: Then was he in order in asking the Premier to withdraw the remark?

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member could ask for a withdrawal.

THE PREMIER: If the Chairman ruled that the words were improper, he would withdraw them.

THE CHAIRMAN: The words should not have been used.

THE PREMIER: Then he withdrew them. Instead of "shocking drivel" he would say "fearful waste of time—shocking waste of time."

MR. THOMAS: Was the hon. member right in saying that a member was guilty of shocking waste of time?

THE CHAIRMAN: That was not unpatriotic.

MR. THOMAS: The Premier should not make a charge of deliberately wasting the time of the House against any member. It was a highly disorderly expression for any member, especially the Premier who was supposed to show members how to conduct themselves. He was surprised that such an expression came from the leader of the House, and he was surprised at the nasty way in which the Premier had withdrawn the expression.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would the hon. member proceed with his argument?

MR. THOMAS: The Premier should obey the ruling of the Chair.

THE PREMIER said he was speaking to one of his colleagues.

MR. THOMAS: The Premier had stated yesterday, emphatically, that he wanted the Upper House to be representative of interests; yet the hon. gentleman had a funny way of showing it. If the member for West Perth was in accord with the principle which had been enunciated by the Premier, that interests should be paramount and population should not be taken into account, he must draw swords with the hon. member on that point.

MR. MORAN: Making the best of a bad bargain; that was all.

MR. THOMAS: The hon. member was inclined to believe that not only the question of interests should be considered, but that population should also be taken into account. It was hardly fair to ask the Committee to agree to the amendment which had been proposed, to leave Balkatta, Canning and Guildford to remain as one province. The hon. member was not moving to strike out the word "metropolitan." That province would consist of 10,500 voters, while in the North Province and in the South Province were some 38,500 electors. The Premier had said that interests only were to be considered. In regard to this province, he could not support the amendment of the member for West Perth, nor could he support the province as it stood. He felt satisfied that the Committee would reject by a big majority the amendment proposed by the member for West Perth, and he (Mr. Thomas) intended to move another amendment when

that was disposed of, regarding the same province, to make things more equitable. The Metropolitan Province had no industry, but it was living upon the industries in other parts of the State, therefore the electors in the Metropolitan Province were not entitled to the same representation *pro rata* as the pastoral people, the agricultural people, the mining people, and the people of the ports of this State.

MR. MORAN: The hon. member meant Perth had no primary industries.

MR. ILLINGWORTH took the Chair.

MR. THOMAS: It had secondary and tertiary industries. When he landed between seven and eight years ago, he found that Perth was a very small village. It had since grown by leaps and bounds, and its growth was purely owing to the goldfields, the agricultural districts, and the pastoral interests going ahead. If interests were to be the paramount consideration for representation in the Upper House, he was right in the assumption that the interest of the mining industry deserved greater consideration than other interests, and that the Metropolitan Province was not entitled to the consideration the member for West Perth desired to give it, and not even to the consideration the Government desired to give it. In the early stages of the mining history of the State he had managed the largest gold-producing mine.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: Was the hon. member entitled to deal with the history of the goldfields?

MR. MORAN: The hon. the Minister should not gag.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: It was a question of wasting time.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. gentleman was not out of order, but was going very dangerously near it.

MR. THOMAS: One was right in showing that the districts to which the Premier desired to give representation in the Upper House were not entitled to it, because they lived on the industries of agriculture and mining. He would use such arguments in a second-reading debate.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member had no right to make second-reading speeches in Committee.

**MR. THOMAS:** The metropolitan area was only entitled to one province, and, if his argument was carried to its logical end, would not be entitled to even one province. If the Premier would consent to an adjournment he (Mr. Thomas) could produce statistics sufficient to defeat the amendment. In the early stages of the progress of the goldfields, with a smaller Upper House than now existed, it was thought right that the goldfields should have three representatives. Was he in order in dealing with the whole of the electoral districts comprised in the Metropolitan Province, or with those only which it was proposed to strike out?

**THE CHAIRMAN:** The question was that the words "Perth, East Perth, North Perth, West Perth" be struck out.

**MR. THOMAS:** They should not be struck out. The Premier had said that interests only should be considered in the provinces; yet the provinces proposed to be struck out had no primary industry of their own. Perth had 2,463 electors on the Federal roll, 2,537 on the State roll, with 3,373 on the Census roll, including the additions to March last. The list distributed showed a difference of 836 between the Census and the State rolls. East Perth had 3,243 on the Federal roll and 2,225 on the State roll, the number on the Census being 3,722; thus showing a difference between the State and the Federal roll of 1,497 electors, and between the Federal and the Census roll of 400 electors. Next North Perth showed on the Federal roll 7,031 electors, on the State roll only 5,796 electors, and on the Census roll (with additions to 28th March last) 7,172 electors. The other constituency concerned was West Perth, and the Federal roll gave the number of electors at 6,059; the number on the State roll was 4,853 electors—it said very little for the way the rolls were kept in this State that there should be such a discrepancy—and the number on the Census roll with additions to the 28th March last was 6,992 electors. In the province there were 23,586 electors, and in the electorates which he had given and which the member for West Perth wished to excise there were some 18,000 electors, which would only leave 5,000 electors to be represented by three members. Such a proposition

was ridiculous in the extreme. There was no sense or reason in asking the Committee to agree to such an amendment. The Committee had already agreed to the proposal that one member should represent 6,240 electors. Then there was a big dissent to one member representing 3,000 electors. Now it was calmly asked that one member should represent only 1,000 electors in the Assembly. He could only assume that the member for West Perth desired to strike out East Perth, North Perth, and West Perth, so as to include them in another province. As a matter of fact the hon. member had said that on the recommitment of the Constitution Bill he intended to move that the Upper House consist of 30 members. The idea of the member for West Perth was evidently that the electorates which he desired to strike out should form a separate province so as to make up the 30 members for the Legislative Council. Such a proposal was totally unfair. The majority of his (Mr. Thomas's) interests were on the Eastern Goldfields; he was getting his bread-and-butter from the Eastern Goldfields; at the same time he had a house or two in the metropolis, and hundreds of other people on the goldfields had houses in Perth.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** What had this to do with the question before the Committee?

**MR. THOMAS:** That these people were not entitled to get separate representation on interests.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** The hon. member was not keeping to the point, and if he did not do so he would presently be asked to desist.

**MR. THOMAS:** If the words were struck out, they must be inserted somewhere. If the hon. member was not prepared to tell us, before his amendment was put, that he intended later on to move either that these electorates should be included in another province or that a separate province should be created for them, we were not in order in voting on the question at all.

**MR. JACOBY** called attention to the state of the House.

Bells rung and quorum formed.

**MR. THOMAS:** If the member for West Perth was not prepared to go farther with his amendment, he (Mr. Thomas) intended to rise to a point of order as to whether we could proceed on

this question. He took it that, if the hon. member desired to strike out these words, it was *prima facie* evidence that he intended to insert the name of another province, because one presumed it was surely not within our power to, with a stroke of the pen, deliberately disfranchise big constituencies like Perth, East Perth, North Perth, and West Perth, and say they should have no representation in the Upper House.

MR. DAGLISH said he was aware of what the member for West Perth was aiming at in moving this amendment, and if the member for Dundas (Mr. Thomas) was willing that he (Mr. Daglish) should put him in possession of the circumstances which led up to the amendment of the member for West Perth, he thought he could satisfy him.

MR. THOMAS said he would be most delighted.

MR. DAGLISH: The member for West Perth was, he thought, largely influenced by the fact that under the existing Constitution Act the Metropolitan Province was very different from the province as proposed to be constituted according to the schedule.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must not make a speech at this stage, but must stick to the point of order.

MR. DAGLISH: There was no wish on his part to rise to a point of order. He rose to explain the reason the member for West Perth had in moving the amendment, as the member for Dundas wanted an explanation, and the member for West Perth was not present. He thought also the Committee, as well as the member for Dundas, wanted an explanation.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must reserve that explanation until the hon. member for Dundas had finished his speech.

MR. DAGLISH: Was one to understand that the member for Dundas had the floor?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

THE COLONIAL TREASURER: Was it necessary when one moved to strike out words that he must also state what he intended to insert afterwards? It seemed a rather strange position.

THE CHAIRMAN: The matter was entirely in the hands of the Committee.

MR. THOMAS: We were not striking out words with a view of inserting any-

thing in lieu thereof, or anything of that sort. If the amendment were put to the Committee now as it was proposed by the member for West Perth, and carried, the words "Perth, East Perth, North Perth, West Perth," would be excised, and "Balkatta, Canning, Guildford," would be left standing opposite the words "Metropolitan Province." If the amendment were carried, Perth, East Perth, North Perth, and West Perth would be disfranchised, so far as the Upper House was concerned, and the member for West Perth should be asked to explain how he intended to reinstate these electorates.

MR. DAGLISH: Not much weight need be attached to the argument of the member for Dundas, who had spoken to the question from a mistaken assumption. If the amendment were carried there would be a Metropolitan Province of three electorates—Balkatta, Canning, and Guildford. It would be more practicable to strike out these three electorates, and leave in the province Perth, East Perth, North Perth, and West Perth. One could approve of an amendment to that effect, which the member for West Perth really desired.

[2 o'clock, a.m.]

MR. JOHNSON called attention to the state of the House.

Bells rung and quorum formed.

MR. DAGLISH: The member for Dundas, in arguing that the metropolitan area was already over-represented, had overlooked the fact that the goldfields retained all the representation they at present enjoyed while the metropolitan area lost three members. Cue and the Geraldton district now returned two goldfields members, so that there were altogether eight goldfields members, six metropolitan, ten agricultural, and three pastoral members; yet the member for Dundas required extra representation for the goldfields. The representation would be in inverse proportion to population. The goldfields, with a population much smaller than the Metropolitan and the West Provinces, would, unless the amendment were carried, be given two more members than those provinces. On the other hand, the agricultural party had two more members than the goldfields, though representing a smaller population than the goldfields

members, and exceeding the metropolitan members by four. Hence, unless the amendment were carried, representation under the Bill would be in inverse proportion to population. His constituency (Subiaco) was embraced by the province that was being abolished—the most populous, with one possible exception, of the lot—and the province which in the past three years had been the most progressive, and which was likely to make most headway in the next three years. Why it was selected for slaughter was not obvious, unless it were that democratic candidates for the Council were somewhat more successful in it than in some other provinces. He supported the amendment, and if it were carried would move that the electorate of Subiaco be added to Balcatta, Canning, and Guildford. The member for Claremont (Mr. Foulkes) would, he understood, move the addition of Claremont also. If that were done it would constitute as the Metropolitan Province the province now known as the Metropolitan-Suburban, and the word “suburban” could be added on recommendation. Thus we should not have the anomaly of a province called the Metropolitan from which the metropolis was expunged. If we passed the amendment and stopped, we should have in the metropolitan district a constituency called Balcatta, the boundaries of which showed that it was altogether unfit to be included in the Metropolitan Province. The proposed Metropolitan Province and the existing Metropolitan-Suburban Province were the only provinces injuriously affected by the schedule; and it was proposed, for the benefit of provinces far less entitled to retain their separate existence as provinces, to rob the people in those two provinces of their proper representation. The Committee should carry the amendment of the member for West Perth, who was entitled to the thanks of all persons living in the Metropolitan-Suburban Province. Before the question went to a vote, it was to be hoped the Premier would withdraw from the position of antagonism which at the outset he assumed towards this matter. It was reasonable that the electors of the Metropolitan-Suburban Province and of the Metropolitan Province should have an opportunity of expressing their views so that Parliament would know what the electors

thought about the question. [MEMBER: The Bill to the people.] He (Mr. Daglish) was in favour of taking not only this Bill, but a lot of other Bills, to the people and giving the people an opportunity of expressing their opinions upon them. If the Metropolitan Province was to be retained as provided in the Bill, there would be no means of getting the Bill to the people. He did not know why Subiaco had been expunged from the Metropolitan Province, and had been transferred to the Fremantle province. On what ground had Guildford been included in the Metropolitan Province while Subiaco, which was eight miles nearer to the metropolis than Guildford, was excluded? The present proposal of the Government was not reasonable. Failing the carrying of the amendment of the member for West Perth, he would like to see some alteration in the Metropolitan Province, though possibly an alteration of a different kind from that now before the Committee. Above all things he would like to see before the matter was settled some expression from the people on this question. We should not suddenly rush a Bill of the magnitude and importance of the Redistribution of Seats Bill, on which there had been no discussion on the second reading. The Bill, had received no consideration from the country at all; probably it had not reached a good many electorates of the country at the present time. To-night the member for West Kimberley (Mr. Pigott) had been voting on some of the amendments, and from the look of things that member had not had the advantage of listening to the arguments. If the Bill had reached West Kimberley, the member representing that district would have had the views of his constituents, and he (Mr. Daglish) was quite satisfied that the electors of West Kimberley would say that the proposal to establish a Metropolitan Province as proposed by the Bill was not right. The electors of the Gascoyne were probably unacquainted with this proposal.

MR. BUTCHER: Already he had informed his constituents of the contents of the Bill.

MR. DAGLISH: There were many constituents of the hon. member who did not know the contents of the Bill. It was not fair to the electors of Subiaco

that members should not have received instructions from their electors on this matter. The Bill that was brought before the people last year was not similar to the Bill now being considered. The Metropolitan Province in the Bill of last session was not the Metropolitan Province contained in the Bill before the Committee. If the Metropolitan Province had been in this schedule as in the schedule of the Bill of last year, the member for West Perth would not have dreamed of bringing before the Committee the amendment proposed. The Minister for Lands (Hon. J. M. Hopkins) just now referred to the fact that several of the amendments in the Bill had been carried last year. That might be true, but to whom did the credit belong? Other members assisted the member for Boulder to carry those very amendments. The hon. member said he had his (Mr. Daglish's) assistance. He probably had the assistance of the member for West Perth too. Would the member for Boulder now return to them the assistance they gave to him last session, especially as it was easily to be proved that the proposal now before the Committee was far more reasonable than any of those which they helped the hon. member to carry last session? This Bill was being rushed with undue rapidity, considering the important way in which it affected a large number of electorates, and that it practically disfranchised the Metropolitan-Suburban Province.

MR. MORAN: Would not the member for South Perth (Mr. Gordon) support the member for Subiaco?

MR. DAGLISH: The member for South Perth felt far more strongly than he himself did. The member for Claremont (Mr. Foulkes) had been with difficulty restrained from breaking into violent ejaculations. One was sorry the member for Dundas (Mr. Thomas) had dragged in that old question—the goldfields *versus* the coast—because he thought the goldfields had learnt that there was no desire in the metropolitan area to treat them with anything but fairness. As a representative of the coastal districts, he (Mr. Daglish) was very anxious to be more than fair, if anything, to the goldfields. He was anxious to see a man recognised as a man,

whether he lived on the goldfields, on the coast, or in the agricultural districts, and that was the spirit which pervaded him in supporting the amendment of the member for West Perth. He wanted to see equality of manhood and equality of womanhood represented in our electoral laws. The first principle of representation should be equality. When we had a property limitation to representation, surely we did not want any farther limitation. He very highly respected the member for Dundas for the breadth of his opinions generally, and would be sorry to find him opposing such an eminently reasonable, practicable, and righteous proposal as that which the member for West Perth had embodied in a concrete form in the amendment now before the Committee. He hoped the Government would support it, and that the member for Boulder would, instead of merely applauding with his voice, applaud with his actions.

MR. MORAN: The main object of his amendment was to have as equitable a redistribution of representation in both Chambers as was possible under these abominable schedules. It would be remembered that he advised this Chamber to do a certain thing. Every stage in the debate to-night had elicited the fact that his advice should have been followed in settling once and for all the Constitution Bill. Then we should have known definitely and finally the exact number of seats we had in the other House. We should not then have found it necessary to go blundering through, hoping to carry amendments, and knowing full well that if we carried one single amendment of this character the Constitution Bill needs must be recommitted again. Evidently we got more confused as we went along. What he said last session had been misquoted. He well remembered saying that the Bill of last session would go no distance whatever towards allaying popular clamour for a more equitable redistribution of seats. He had said it honestly and earnestly.

MR. JOHNSON called attention to the state of the House.

Bells rung and quorum formed.

MR. MORAN: It was the fault of the Government there was no quorum present.

MR. HIGHAM: That statement was untrue. Two members from the Opposition side had left the Chamber.

MR. MORAN: If the Bill could be defeated by counting out the House, he would do it. The Bill was a most unworthy measure, and the forms of the House could be utilised to call attention to the state of the House, so that if possible the Bill might be rejected. Why should Western Australia lag behind other States in the Federation, and be content with the present proposal to deal with the one question that absorbed the attention of the British voter in every part of the Empire? New Zealand's Upper Chamber was a nominee Chamber; but the Lower House, being elected on a population basis, received a direct mandate from the people, so that the Government which expressed that mandate could see that the will of the people was represented in the Upper Chamber. On one occasion he (Mr. Moran) made a speech in New Zealand, in which he referred to the growing tendency to abolish Upper Chambers, and expressed wonder that New Zealand had not abolished her nominee House. In reply the New Zealand Premier said that the Upper House members there were nominated by the Government, so that the popular will was expressed in the Upper House. As we in this State gave only a section of the people the right to vote for the Legislative Council, and could not have strict popular representation in the Assembly, let us give an equal value to all votes for the Upper House. If Perth were left with Balkatta, Canning, and Guildford, there would be an unwieldy province; for instead of 10,000 votes, as the amendment proposed, the province would have 14,000. Cut the Metropolitan Province in two. The member for Dundas said there were no industries represented in the Metropolitan Province, and that he would not give the metropolis any representation.

MR. THOMAS: That he had never said. He had explained that he did not want certain constituencies cut out. He had never stated that he wished Perth, East Perth, North Perth, or West Perth to be disfranchised, nor said anything of the kind.

MR. JOHNSON: Did not the hon. member say so yesterday?

MR. THOMAS: No; not yesterday. He never said any of these districts should be disfranchised.

[3 o'clock, a.m.]

MR. MORAN: It was very unfair of the Premier, in the midst of this earnest battle, not to consent to an adjournment. He intended to speak at great length on the principles which he had enunciated, and he was driven to this course because once to-night the Government whip sought to catch the eye of the Chairman to put on the "gag." He had no friendliness towards the Government, and he would not give them a chance of attempting that again for some time. The standpoint taken by the member for Dundas was that an invitation was held forth by the Premier to consider the Upper House question from the view of interests; and the member for Dundas said that since Perth had no primary interests or industries, it was not entitled to representation in the Upper Chamber.

MR. THOMAS: What he had said was that Perth was entitled to an interest, but not to the same interest as those provinces where there were primary industries to protect.

MR. MORAN: The hon. member said that Perth should get an interest. Did he mean that he would allow the Metropolitan Province to remain as it was with three members on a population basis of 20,000?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS interjected.

MR. JOHNSON: Was the member for Boulder in order in interjecting from a wrong seat? The Minister had been doing so all night.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member was not in order in interjecting at all; certainly not when he was not in his own seat.

MR. MORAN: The member for Dundas had said there were no particular interests around Perth, and he (Mr. Moran) then interjected that what was meant was primary industries. The member assented, and therefore Perth was not entitled to fair representation according to the numbers. The member for Dundas opened up a new vista about primary and what were called secondary industries. The Premier had stated that he would like the Upper House considered on interests;

and the Premier proposed as nearly as possible to adopt an intermediate course between industries and population for the Upper House. Why should a man with a small wheat-farm or a Martini carbine for shooting kangaroos, or a man engaged in growing timber or any of those other avocations in the bush, have special representation in a Chamber with such terrific powers as the Upper House had for legislation, while men with small businesses in Perth had no representation? He did not admit that the question of interests as opposed to vested property should be a basis of the franchise for the Upper House. He went for mankind. His influence was cast for the man or woman who had some property in Western Australia. He did not think we could differentiate between one class of property and another. In reference to the lower Chamber, the man who worked for 6s. a day and had only a humble cot to shelter himself and perhaps his large family, was as much interested in the progress of Western Australia as was the man who had £100,000. All were engaged in the development of the State, having their means invested in it. Perth should only be judged by the number of people who held property in it entitling them to vote for the Upper House. The member for Boulder last session delivered a speech against the proposals of the Government for the redistribution of seats under the Constitution Bill.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: The hon. member should read the speech.

MR. MORAN said he would read it to the committee. [Speech by Mr. Hopkins (Boulder), on second reading of Constitution Act Amendment Bill, read *in extenso*, pages 1876 to 1884, vol. 2 of *Parliamentary Debates*, 1902.]

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (interrupting the reading): A second-reading speech could not be read, when dealing in Committee with the first schedule of the present Bill.

THE CHAIRMAN: The member for West Perth could proceed.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: From what part of *Hansard* was this quoted?

MR. MORAN: Page 1877.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Read the whole passage.

MR. MORAN said he would do so. [Reading continued.] Did the Minister wish him to continue this?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Now the hon. member had started he had better finish it. That was the best speech he had delivered.

MR. MORAN: On the invitation of the hon. member he must read this speech through. [Reading continued.] According to the member for Boulder, it was going to be as difficult to find a supporter of that Bill in this House last session as it was for Diogenes to find an honest man in Athens; but it evidently did not prove so difficult as the hon. member predicted, for Diogenes, in the person of the Premier, had since found one man in the House who was prepared to support him in that Bill, to swallow all he had previously said about it, and agree to be silent this session.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: That was not so.

MR. MORAN: That was so. He hoped he was not taking an unfair advantage of the hon. member.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: The hon. member was making a statement which was not true.

MR. MORAN resumed the reading of the speech.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: There was not one word, so far, dealing with the Upper House.

MR. MORAN: If the hon. member asked him to desist, he would do so.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS said he did not object to the hon. member reading his speech. He was only too pleased to hear it, and he repeated what he had said before, that it was the best one he had heard the hon. member deliver.

MR. JOHNSON: Were sleeping members counted in the quorum? He did not think it was fair they should be included.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair took no notice.

[MR. MORAN continued reading the speech.]

[4 o'clock, a.m.]

THE CHAIRMAN: What use was the hon. member going to make of the quotation?

MR. MORAN: In speaking, he had accused the present Government of having

elements of discord in their midst; and he now brought forward the strongest indictment made by a member of the present Government against a Bill infinitely better than this. [Reading continued.] He said the Minister for Lands went so far in this speech as to propose, if he could, to drag the Government (of which he was now a member) before the High Court of Australia and impeach them. [Reading continued.]

**THE MINISTER FOR MINES:** Were the matters which the hon. member was reading relevant to the question?

**THE CHAIRMAN** said he did not know what application the hon. member intended to make of them. He would not have allowed this reading, if the Minister had not asked for it.

**THE MINISTER FOR MINES:** The hon. member was talking about Mr. Quick, Dr. Garran, and other persons. Were the points he was reading relevant to the question before the House?

**MR. MORAN:** Entirely; every one of them.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** The hon. member was, he thought, in order.

**MR. MORAN** said he had wished to avoid reading the speech, having plenty of other material; but the Minister for Lands challenged him to read the speech.

**MR. FOULKES** rose to a point of order. The Chairman had mentioned that he would not have allowed the reading of this speech to go on, had not the member for Boulder requested the hon. member to read it. The point he wished to raise was that the fact that the member for Boulder asked the member for West Perth to read his speech had no weight whatever. It was not a question of his wish, but really a question for the Committee as a whole.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** The hon. member (Mr. Moran) was not out of order. Still, he would have ruled that the hon. member was unduly occupying the time of the Committee.

**MR. FOULKES:** The fact that the member for Boulder wished the speech to be read should not be considered at all. The member for Boulder was only one member of the House.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** The hon. member had risen to a point of order.

**MR. FOULKES** said he wanted to make his point clear.

**THE CHAIRMAN** said he did not see any point at all.

**MR. FOULKES:** The point was that the member for Boulder was only one member of the House, and his wish should not be considered.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** It had been ruled by him that the reading was not out of order, strictly.

**MR. MORAN:** If he might do so, he would skip a column and a half, to come to the peroration.

**THE CHAIRMAN** said he wanted to know what the application of that was.

**MR. MORAN:** Was it wished that he should interpolate all his remarks? [Reading of speech resumed.]

**MR. JACOBY:** Was a member in order in reading a daily newspaper, while sitting in his place?

**THE CHAIRMAN:** There was nothing to prevent his doing so, provided he did not read it to the Committee.

**MR. MORAN:** It had always been ruled otherwise.

**MR. WALLACE:** No.

**MR. MORAN** (having concluded the reading): Prior to reading this speech to the Committee he had been dealing with the interests of Perth and its industries.

**THE MINISTER FOR LANDS:** And the hon. member was interrupted because he made untruthful statements.

**MR. MORAN** demanded a withdrawal.

**THE MINISTER FOR LANDS** withdrew the remark.

**MR. MORAN:** After considering the interests of Perth, he would consider the higher question of the bicameral system. The amendment aimed at equal vote values for the Upper House. The Government proposed to have property representation in the Assembly, and a most unequal property representation in the Council. The Premier, with his characteristic carelessness—

**THE CHAIRMAN:** The hon. member must confine himself to the point. He had made an amendment to strike out certain words.

**MR. MORAN:** And had been obliged to speak at length to protest against the high-handed action of the Government in not consenting to an adjournment.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** If the hon. member said he was occupying time in order to protest, he would be out of order.

**MR. MORAN:** What he had said was with a view to defeat the Government in their attempt to cut up certain provinces unequally.

[5 o'clock, a.m.]

**THE MINISTER FOR LANDS:** The preceding speaker had wasted the time of the Committee by a characteristically long-winded address. The amendment proposed to strike out certain electorates in the proposed Metropolitan Province; and speaking on that the hon. member quoted portions of a speech delivered by him (the Minister) as an independent member during the last session of Parliament, on redistribution of seats as proposed in the Constitution Bill in its application to the Lower House only; and now the hon. member sought, by manœuvring the question, to apply his remarks to the Upper House.

**MR. MORAN:** The hon. member asked for it.

**THE MINISTER FOR LANDS:** That was right. The speech was very clear, and he now asked permission to read portions which the member for West Perth had drawled out. [Extract from Mr. Hopkins's speech of last session read.] What he had just read was sufficient for him to point out that in delivering the speech during last session it was directed entirely to the redistribution of seats for the Lower House, and the Lower House alone. He had occasion to make correction after correction during the reading of the speech by the member for West Perth; yet with persistent effrontery the hon. member went on misrepresenting what he last session endeavoured to place before the House and the country in that speech. Last year he asked for a royal commission to deal with the electorates; and he did not know but what members in the House would say that the remarks which he had made were right, and that he had devoted some intelligent consideration to the proposals which he had brought forward. The propositions were worth fighting for, and if a question of compromise came along it could be considered after the preliminary fighting was over. He had made his position very clear on that standpoint. He had no occasion to regret any public speech he had made, and he wished to recall nothing that he had said or done.

There was nothing at variance, in that speech, with the position he occupied to-day. The position, he was proud to think, was unanimously confirmed when he went before his electors, which was a very pleasing reversal from that experienced by the member for West Perth when he presented himself to the electors of Kalgoorlie under similar circumstances.

**MR. MORAN:** The hon. member had swallowed his principles on this matter.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** The hon. member must confine himself to the question before the Chair.

**MR. MORAN** rose to make a personal explanation.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** The hon. member could do that.

**MR. MORAN:** The Minister for Lands had swallowed all the opinions which he had expressed last session in reference to redistribution of seats. No matter what the hon. member's actions in the past might be, one appreciated his character, and there was no need for the hon. member to advertise himself. One appreciated the worth of the Minister for Lands, and would like to know what the consideration was for giving up the opinions which he held last session. The Minister of Lands had said that the speech he made applied to the Lower House, and that he (Mr. Moran) had no right to apply it to the Upper Chamber. Then he would call on the Minister when the distribution of seats for the Lower House came on, to divide against his own Government whenever it was proposed by amendment to give a more equal distribution of seats.

**THE MINISTER FOR LANDS:** It was pleasant to find a convert in the member for West Perth.

**MR. MORAN:** It was to be hoped the hon. member would prove true to his colours. All members had to take their hard knocks with the best of good grace. We got them and gave them.

**THE MINISTER FOR LANDS** said he had objected to the member misquoting his speech of last session.

**MR. MORAN:** It was not intended to misquote the hon. member at all. His only object was to point out the insincerity of the Government in the matter.

**MR. BATH:** It was pleasant to see members showing such a devotion to duty

to-night; therefore it gave him occasion to recall remarks which had been made when it was proposed to lengthen the hours which the House should sit, and when it was found there was such strong opposition by members who were so persistent this evening. He purposed speaking in regard to this matter much earlier in the evening, and had been burning with anxiety to make a few remarks on the question; but owing to the fact that it took the member for Subiaco, the member for West Perth, and the member for Dundas such a long time to address themselves to the question on account of the weighty issues involved and the long and laboured arguments entered into, he had to refrain from speaking until a later hour. He had no blame to attach to those members, because he thought a question of such paramount importance needed long discussion. The member for Dundas had made reference to the feeling between the goldfields and the coastal districts or metropolitan area. It was to be regretted the member for Dundas should have introduced such a tone into the debate. The interests of the coastal districts and of the goldfields districts lay together in these matters; and instead of any member trying to pull them farther apart than they were at present, an effort should certainly have been made to consolidate the interests so that the metropolitan districts and the goldfields districts could have combined to defeat the unjust proposals brought forward. In the Metropolitan Province there were 23,711 voters, and there was a proposal to divide this province into two, giving, roughly, 12,000 electors to each. Members had referred to the fact that in the Legislative Assembly we must give consideration to scattered electorates, and that we must have a larger quota of electors per member in the populous electorates in the goldfields and in the metropolitan area than in the scattered farming districts. If we granted that, let us have some consistency at least in the representation in another place.

MR. PIGOTT: Members had spoiled the whole chance of that when they would not allow 10 provinces.

MR. BATH: The same unjust system would have been perpetuated.

MR. PIGOTT: Not at all.

MR. BATH: It was the proposal of the Labour party to have a larger number of provinces. The member for Kanowna (Mr. Hastie) or the member for Subiaco (Mr. Daglish) moved for 12 provinces, and the hon. member for West Kimberley opposed that.

MR. PIGOTT: Ten were moved for by him.

MR. BATH: The hon. member's desire was to perpetuate the system of having 30 members for the other House.

MR. PIGOTT: Quite right.

[MR. HARPER took the Chair.]

MR. BATH: What the Labour members desired to see instituted in this State was the same as that which existed in the other States—a proportion of one member of the Legislative Council to two members of the Legislative Assembly. The member for West Kimberley opposed the amendment to increase the provinces to 12, and moved an amendment to retain the number at 10, to perpetuate a system of six years' tenure for members of that House, and to retain the present inequalities in that representation. It had been stated by some members that no member of the select committee had made any protest against this redistribution. The member for West Perth (Mr. Moran) had tried to take all the credit, and had ignored what appeared on the minutes. On the 2nd September the member for Kanowna moved to strike out "additional," that was one additional seat to the farming interest and one to the goldfields, and explained that both additional members should go to the goldfields. One had no doubt that the hon. member had used figures which, if the member for West Kimberley (Mr. Pigott) and others had been reasonable and fair-minded men, would have convinced them as to the fairness of the proposal, but they used the majority to wipe out that proposal. The whole subject-matter of this debate affected redistribution as far as the schedule was concerned. The whole question of redistribution of seats hung on this amendment. Members had had no opportunity of discussing the matter on the second reading of the Bill, and when it was brought into Committee and members desired to give it that earnest consideration to which it was entitled, they found the Government

trying to rush the measure through. The member for Kanowna in connection with the schedule moved to add to the paragraph these words, "and the Committee advises that this additional province be added to the metropolitan or goldfields area." The two provinces should have been taken from the portions of the State to which they at present were allotted, and one of them given to the metropolis and the other to the goldfields. The East Province consisted of Brownhill, Ivanhoe, Kanowna, Kurradjong, Menzies, and Mt. Margaret, with a total of 19,600 voters. In the South-East Province we had Coolgardie, Boulder, Dundas, Hannans, Kalgoorlie, and Yilgarn, with 18,206 voters. On the basis of representation allotted here we would have to give them three or four provinces instead of two, and the same applied to the Central Province and the West Province. That was the contention throughout. While something approaching a fair redistribution was sought for, it was not asked that it should be essentially on a population basis. Big, scattered electorates, both mining and agricultural, should have consideration, but the man in the farming districts should not receive more consideration than the man on the goldfields. In New South Wales, Queensland, and South Australia representation was as nearly as possible on a population basis, and in South Australia the same applied to the Upper House. The member for the Williams desired to give representation to the farming districts on an anticipated population of 20, or 50, or 100 years hence.

MR. JOHNSON called attention to the state of the House.

Bells rung and quorum formed.

MR. BATH: The member for the Williams had stated that population in the agricultural districts was increasing at a greater ratio than on the goldfields. He (Mr. Bath) would allow the goldfields to remain as at present, and it would be many years before the agricultural districts would catch up in the point of population. Justice should be done as far as possible now, and the goldfields should be given a chance to catch up the handicap to which they had been subjected in the past. There was neither logic nor common sense nor reason in the

statement of the leader of the Opposition that the Labour party had changed front. Though each side of the House had quoted *Hansard*, no one quoted it to bear out the contention that there had been a change of front by the Labour party. *Hansard* contained no evidence of such inconsistency, and the accusation came with ill grace from the leader of the Opposition. On the 7th September, 1899, speaking on the redistribution of seats for the Legislative Council, the present Premier (Mr. James), then a private member, strongly favoured a redistribution on an equitable basis, having due regard to population; and the then Premier (Sir John Forrest) replied that he did not think the question of population was very important in regard to representation in the Upper House, and that the time might come when we should desire the provinces to be divided somewhat in accordance with population, though in the past that rule had not been followed. As a fact, he (Mr. Bath) maintained the time never did arrive for redistribution of seats. Something always stood in the way—either the goldfields were not fully developed, or the population was shifting, or the farming districts needed encouragement. In 1899 the arguments were precisely similar to those used on this occasion.

MR. PIGOTT: Did Sir John Forrest treat the goldfields badly?

MR. BATH: Most decidedly, with regard to political rights, though he tried to make up for such treatment by railway proposals and water schemes. Sir John Forrest, in the same speech, said "The Government had tried to divide the colony into sections with different interests, as far as possible." The present Premier had gone to his old opponent for a scheme to give representation to interests. Said Sir John, "It was not well to have two interests mixed up." But it was not well to consider interests at all. First, it was proposed that the Upper House should represent property. No arguments were adduced in support of that, its advocates relying on strength of numbers. To-night it was said the Upper House should represent interests as well as property. In 1899 several goldfields members supported the present Premier in his opposition to Sir John Forrest's scheme of redistribution for the

Upper House; yet now we found members who then pleaded for redistribution on a population basis, perpetuating the old system in this Bill; and though there was no opportunity of discussing the Bill on the second reading, it was being rushed through Committee in a hasty and ill-considered manner.

MR. PIGOTT: There was one aspect of the question with regard to the work done by the select committee which had not been taken into consideration at all. He would like members of the Committee to consider the position of the Bill when it was handed to the select committee to report. The Bill contained, and he was referring specially to the schedule under consideration, provision for two provinces for the goldfields, two for the northern districts, two for the metropolitan area, and two for the agricultural districts. Everyone in the country must admit that if we were to try in any way to bring the matter of population into the question as a basis of dividing provinces, we should start by taking into consideration the size of the two vastly populated districts in the different parts of the State; and we should have to allot to the goldfields and the metropolitan district the same share of representation in the Upper House. The North, he thought every man would admit, was deserving of every consideration. The duty then was cast on members to place in amongst the eight provinces an extra province as instructed by the House. Before the Bill went to the select committee there had been trouble, and the House decided to fix the number of provinces at nine. The goldfields could not get that extra province, or it would have been an injustice to the metropolitan area, and for the same reason the metropolitan districts could not get the extra province. Was the extra province to go to the North, or where was it to go? To the agricultural districts. As to placing representation on a population basis, he said unhesitatingly, and every State in the Commonwealth had approved of the idea, that the Upper House should not be elected on a population basis. That was laid down in the Commonwealth Constitution.

MR. MORAN: The hon. member was not quite right.

MR. PIGOTT: There was Tasmania, with a population roughly of 180,000 people.

MR. BATH: The Constitution of the Federal Government was not the Constitution of Tasmania.

MR. PIGOTT: Tasmania had the same representation in the Senate as New South Wales had, yet members were told that we were doing an unheard of thing to-night. Was the Upper House in this State elected on anything else but a property qualification?

MR. BATH: That was altogether different from the basis of the Senate. The Senate was there to preserve State rights.

MR. PIGOTT: What was the Upper House of the State Parliament for? Practically the same purpose.

MR. BATH: Then give an equal amount of property in each electorate.

MR. PIGOTT: Why not do the same in the Federal Parliament? The member for Hannans always wished to twist things round to suit his own purpose; he talked about the injustice which was being done to a great section of the community by not having both Houses of Parliament elected on a population basis. One could refer the hon. member to the creeds of the Labour party throughout Australia. Did they recognise in all their matters a population basis? Did they in their conferences recognise a population basis? In their election to the unions did they recognise population at all? But here in the House one man was as good as another. Why did not the Labour members back up the principle in their own affairs?

MR. JOHNSON: The hon. member was wrong on that point, and he would be wrong on the next, probably.

MR. PIGOTT: Nothing had been done for the goldfields. That was practically the cry that the members on the Labour benches raised. He did not believe in the necessity for a Redistribution of Seats Bill at all, but having passed the Bill last session, he did what he could to alter it in accordance with his ideas. He had given way a good deal. The Bill before the House was not the Bill the Government ought to have introduced.

MR. MORAN: There had been a compromise between the hon. member and the Government.

MR. PIGOTT: It was the Bill as altered by the Opposition.

MR. MORAN: It was a compromise between the Opposition and the Government. The Government had climbed down.

MR. PIGOTT: The Government accepted amendment after amendment until the whole name of redistribution practically was taken out of the matter. Under the present Constitution there were 19 members representing the agricultural and pastoral industries; there were 15 members directly representing the mining interests, and six members directly representing the metropolitan area.

MR. BATH: There were twelve.

MR. PIGOTT: The committee had cut off from the agricultural representation three members, and out of these three, two had been given to the gold-fields and one to the metropolitan-suburban district.

MR. MORAN: Was that in reference to the Upper House?

MR. PIGOTT: In the Lower House. That was what the select committee did. As the Premier had said, everyone would agree that, no matter what scheme the select committee had brought forward, it would have been open to objection. Why was it no member stood up and said "Here is an amendment we will bring forward which will do some good?" The amendment now brought forward was that a few words should be struck out, and there was no saying what would be done. It was said "Let us group these two constituencies together." This matter had been fought out in the House. The leader of the Labour party (Mr. Hastie) admitted that the fight on this redistribution was practically finished on the Constitution Bill. He admitted that he was fairly beaten and the Government admitted that they were fairly beaten, that instead of there being only eight provinces in the Upper House there would be nine and that each of these nine provinces was to return three members elected for a six years' tenure.

MR. JOHNSON: The Labour party did not agree to that.

MR. PIGOTT: The Labour party voted against it, but the member for Kanowna (Mr. Hastie) admitted that he was beaten and was prepared to accept

that. He said he would agree to nine provinces.

MR. HASTIE: That was never said by him.

MR. PIGOTT said he thought he was quite correct. The hon. member stated that he would vote against it, but said he could not do anything else. He (Mr. Pigott) asked members to be fair. If there had been any chance of throwing this measure out, he would have voted against the Bill. He voted against it last year, and would have done so this.

MR. BATH: The hon. member would have thrown it out because he did not want redistribution at all. The Labour party wanted a fair redistribution.

MR. PIGOTT said he would have voted against the measure; but what would have been the result? A Bill far more drastic than the measure in its present form would have been accepted. The Opposition had in his opinion obtained a signal victory out of the Bill. The select committee had nothing to do with the formation of the Bill, but merely inserted recommendations, and it was for this Committee to say whether they would accept it. Why did not members refuse to accept the report of the select committee?

MR. NANSON: Members had tried to do that at this sitting, but the hon. member voted against it.

MR. PIGOTT said he was not aware of any motion being brought up to that effect at all.

THE PREMIER: The present was a good stage to deal with it.

MR. PIGOTT: Why was not a substantive motion brought forward? No member was prepared to bring forward a better scheme.

MR. MORAN: Members were not allowed to get to that stage.

MR. PIGOTT said he would have much preferred that during the long hours the member had addressed the House he had given us some scheme which members might have considered.

MR. MORAN: One would give it to the hon. member in a few words—redistribution on a population basis.

MR. PIGOTT: That would not be carried.

MR. MORAN: Would the hon. member support it?

MR. PIGOTT: No; he would not support it.

MR. MORAN: That settled it.

MR. PIGOTT: We must consider the peculiar position we were in, having such a large country under our control which was so exceedingly wealthy and so sparsely populated. We could not take into consideration the question of population on a matter of redistribution until we could give to the northern portion of this State some form of self-government which would free it from the necessity of such representation in this House. If that could be brought about, the southern portion of the State and the goldfields might, he thought, have a fair redistribution. Seventy-five per cent. of the exports from this State, omitting gold, were from the North.

MR. HASTIE: And excluding timber.

MR. PIGOTT: Seventy-five per cent. of the total exports except gold—the whole of the cattle trade, wool trade, and pearlshell fishery export business was done there. When the meat supply overtook the local demand, we should have an export trade in that. If we took into consideration the value of those four industries of the North which he had mentioned, it was absurd to say we could arrange for a Parliament on a purely population basis in Western Australia.

MR. MORAN: Let us give the North special treatment, and have a population basis for the populous parts of the State.

MR. PIGOTT: On that matter he would have met the hon. member, but the hon. member never mentioned a suggestion of this kind. The hon. member came into the House at the eleventh hour and did not take the trouble to read the report of what had been done. The hon. member must admit that under the existing circumstances the idea of having a Parliament elected on a population basis in Western Australia was at the present time absolutely impracticable.

MR. MORAN: No one asked for it.

MR. PIGOTT: The hon. member asked for it. He asked the hon. member what he believed in, and the hon. member replied that he believed in a Parliament being elected on a purely population basis.

MR. TAYLOR: The member for West Perth did not ask for that in this Bill.

MR. MORAN: What he asked for was representation on a population basis, with some consideration given to the North.

MR. PIGOTT: The *personnel* of the select committee had, he thought, been challenged, but there was a member representing the goldfields, a member representing Perth—

MR. MORAN: Who was the goldfields member?

MR. PIGOTT: The member for Kanowna (Mr. Hastie).

MR. TAYLOR: One might as well at once have put the Premier there as a goldfields representative.

MR. PIGOTT: The select committee had been composed of a member representing the goldfields, a member representing the metropolitan area, a member representing the agricultural industry, a member representing the pastoral industry, and a member representing the largest port of Western Australia, so that it was a fair committee, representing all sections of the community, and its report and recommendations were absolutely justifiable.

[6 o'clock, a.m.]

MR. NANSON: Judging from the speech of the leader of the Opposition, we had arrived exactly at the position from which we had started eight or ten hours previously. No one had disputed the point that representation on a population basis was perfectly equitable. Had the Premier allowed the Constitution Bill to be first settled by the Chamber, and had an opportunity been given to debate the question with the Speaker in the Chair as to whether the recommendations of the select committee could be sent back to the committee, it would have been utterly impossible to have had the oft-repeated speeches of the night. Now we were no nearer a solution of the difficulty, and the debate might go on for hours. The Legislative Council would deal with the schedule as it thought fit. Were we to stand firm against the Legislative Council and run the risk of sacrificing the whole Bill? Having been pledged to a redistribution of seats, he did not intend, if he could avoid it, going back to his constitu-

ents without some sort of a Bill having been passed. If the Legislative Council decided not to allow the changes proposed by us, we would necessarily have to reform the Assembly. The position of parties in the House was sufficient indication that we could do with a great deal of redistribution. Now both sides had shown themselves firm, it might be possible to arrange an adjournment after passing the first schedule, and to later on discuss the second schedule, which would mean a harder fight. There was no guarantee that, once the first schedule was finished, the fight would not continue on the second. The Premier had offered to give facilities for fully discussing the second schedule. The members for West Perth and Dundas might recognise that it would be better to suspend hostilities and deal with the more practical portion of the Bill, that portion dealing with the Assembly.

**THE PREMIER:** The member for the Murchison should not hold him responsible for the prolonged debate. On two or three occasions last session the hon. member had equally held him responsible, so that he was not surprised at his doing so now. When the member for West Perth suggested that this Bill might be laid aside till the Constitution Bill had been disposed of, he (the Premier) said that if the hon. member's amendments to the Constitution Bill were carried, this Bill would be recommitted and a fresh select committee appointed to reconsider it. Surely no member had ever found him (the Premier) trying to burk discussion. Time after time he had shown willingness to assist even his opponents in raising discussions on Bills of which he had charge. Yesterday afternoon and evening, until 10:30 there was a general discussion on this schedule, and he had thought the hon. member was trying to secure the discussion he had sought on the Constitution Bill, and having had that general discussion, would go on to specific issues in the schedule. But after the amendment in relation to the Metropolitan Province, some members made long and dreary speeches. Surely the hon. member would admit that it was extremely difficult to frame such a schedule so as to satisfy everybody. Decide on the amendment now before us, pass the first

schedule, report progress, and take the second schedule at the next sitting.

**MR. MORAN:** To that he had no objection. He had spoken at length on his amendment because he had doubted whether he would have a chance of recommitting the Bill on third reading; and of that he still had doubts, for he believed the Government would strongly oppose the proposal for a recommitment. Yesterday, on his amendment he had dealt with the main principle that the Bill was unjust to the people. A section of the direct Opposition then took up the battle against the Bill in general, and carried the fight into the camp of the Government. He (Mr. Moran) reluctantly supported the member for Dundas, and asked him not to conduct the attack by the method of moving that progress be reported.

Amendment (to strike out Perth, East Perth, North Perth, West Perth) put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	...	...	...	10
Noes	...	...	...	20

Majority against ... 10

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Daglish	Mr. Burges
Mr. Hastie	Mr. Butcher
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Diamond
Mr. Moran	Mr. Ferguson
Mr. Nanson	Mr. Fonkies
Mr. Purkiss	Mr. Gardiner
Mr. Reid	Mr. Gordon
Mr. Taylor	Mr. Gregory
Mr. Thomas	Mr. Hassell
Mr. Wallace (Teller).	Mr. Hayward
	Mr. Hopkins
	Mr. Jacoby
	Mr. James
	Mr. Phillips
	Mr. Piesse
	Mr. Pigott
	Mr. Reason
	Mr. Smith
	Mr. Yelverton
	Mr. Higham (Teller).

Mr. Moran's amendment thus negatived.

**MR. DAGLISH** moved as an amendment,

That the word "Subiaco" be added after "Perth" in the Metropolitan Province.

The intention was to transfer Subiaco electorate from the West Province to the Metropolitan Province.

**THE PREMIER:** That would make the West Province too small by far.

**MR. DAGLISH:** Take in Guildford.

**MR. MORAN:** Tack the Murray on to Fremantle; that would be more in keep-

ing with the West Province than Subiaco was.

MR. DAGLISH: Subiaco had no interests in common with Fremantle. Guildford was 10 or 12 miles away from Perth, and yet it had been included in the Metropolitan Province. The same thing in reference to Subiaco had been attempted in the Federal distribution, but he thought the Federal Government were likely to undo what had been done. The Premier would recognise the fairness of his contention. Whatever the metropolitan interests were they were shared by Subiaco.

THE PREMIER: The Committee were not dealing with the Fremantle Province, but the West Province, and the member for Subiaco wished to remove Subiaco from the West Province because it was practically a Fremantle province. If Subiaco were struck out, for the same reason Claremont would ask to be struck out, because all persons living at Claremont did business in Perth, and were connected with Perth. Subiaco might just as well remain in the West Province as in the Metropolitan Province. If Subiaco were taken from the West Province it would mean taking away nearly 3,000 electors. He asked the member for Subiaco to disregard the West Province as the Fremantle province. The best distribution had been given in the Bill.

MR. FOULKES: The district of Claremont was included in the West Province, but he hoped that ultimately in the Upper House an alteration would be made to remove Claremont and Subiaco from the West Province, and add another province to the schedule. The result of the tactics of the member for West Perth would be to draw the attention of the Upper House to what had been done, and then a new province might be added to the schedule. The Metropolitan-Suburban Province was one of the largest in the country, and there was some difficulty in arranging it so that the West Province would be brought nearly equal to the Metropolitan Province. He expected this would be remedied, and the matter dealt with more dispassionately in another place.

MR. TAYLOR: There was a deal of force in the argument of the member for Subiaco. He looked on Subiaco as

almost a portion of Perth; there was almost a continuity of buildings from Perth to Subiaco. Canning was included in the Metropolitan Province, but Subiaco was more a portion of Perth and closer than South Perth, which was really the Canning. South Perth contained more garden areas, while Subiaco was purely a suburban area. The interests of Subiaco were in touch with the Metropolitan Province more than with the West Province. The fact of the Premier arguing that the West Province was not a Fremantle province did not alter the position at all. He would support the amendment because it was unfair for the committee to remove Subiaco from the Metropolitan Suburban area and place it in the West Province.

[MR. ILLINGWORTH took the Chair.]

MR. MORAN: This was another illustration of the futility of hoping to arrive at satisfaction in having ten provinces for the State. He would, however, rather have ten than nine. He wished the State to be divided into four provinces. He tried to draw a distinction between Subiaco and Fremantle or Perth and Fremantle. If the member for Claremont (Mr. Foulkes) wished to obviate these anomalies he would support recommitting the Constitution Bill, and electing six members, or nine if he preferred, for the Metropolitan Province as a whole. However great the anomaly in reference to population, he was going to vote to include Subiaco. It was anomalous enough to have over 20,000 electors in the province; but there was an endeavour to drag Subiaco away from Perth to get rid of some objectionable element, that being the Labour element. It was sought to remove Subiaco from Perth to make Perth more secure. Subiaco was, however, the most integral part of Perth outside the city itself.

THE PREMIER: "Subiaco" could be inserted instead of "Canning."

MR. MORAN: Where would the hon. gentleman put "Canning?"

THE PREMIER: It could be joined to the West Province.

MR. MORAN: Members would allow somebody else to do that. At present he was going to move to have Subiaco in.

THE PREMIER said he would move that.

MEMBER: We could not go back.

MR. MORAN: It did not appear now so much to matter whether we put Subiaco in or not. The question of population had been entirely discarded.

MR. GORDON: It would be an admirable idea to remove Canning from the Metropolitan Province and insert Subiaco in its place.

THE CHAIRMAN: Members might add Subiaco, then recommit the Bill and formally strike out Canning.

MR. JOHNSON: This was a question about which we need not concern ourselves, because in his opinion all members would realise that this Bill was framed to meet the desires of the Upper House so as to leave the number where it was at present, and put back the Metropolitan-Suburban Province. He anticipated that the Council would leave the number of members at 30, and the Government, to anticipate the desire to leave the membership at that number, had put this Metropolitan Province in rather large, in order that the Council could strike it out and put in the Metropolitan-Suburban Province.

MR. MORAN: That, he believed, was the scheme.

MR. JOHNSON: This would be done by the Legislative Council in order to give less representation to the goldfields, because there would be 19,600 electors in the East Province, a portion of the goldfields area, and 18,206 in the South-East Province, another portion of the goldfields area, these two provinces being represented by six members, and the Metropolitan-Suburban Province would be inserted to swamp the goldfields and take the power of the goldfields away. This was anticipated by the Government.

THE PREMIER: The difficulty with regard to the metropolitan area had been pointed out by him in the afternoon.

MR. THOMAS: It behoved the Government to declare their attitude, so that members might perfectly understand what the Government meant. Before hearing the member for Kalgoorlie (Mr. Johnson), he was under the impression that the Government intended to act honestly by the country in this matter, but now he was thoroughly convinced that there was something in what that hon. member said. He could quite appreciate that the Premier was only too

anxious to allow Subiaco to be added to Perth, in order to make the province a little bit bigger and make the case more glaring so as to insure that the Upper House would do his bidding in this respect.

THE PREMIER said he wanted to strike out Canning.

MR. THOMAS: There had been lots of occasions in this House on which the Government were prepared and willing to strike out this, that, and the other thing, and make this, that, and the other better, but when it came before members we had found the Government recommending for their own purpose. The Premier now said he wanted to strike out Canning and insert Subiaco.

THE PREMIER said he would rather have the Bill as it stood.

MR. THOMAS: Subiaco, as an integral part of Perth, should not be dragged away from Perth and tacked on to Fremantle, with which it had no community of interests. Both Hay street and Wellington street extended past the boundary of Perth into Subiaco, so that it would be wise to include Subiaco with Perth. The interests of the two places were identical. The recent proposal to alter the name of Subiaco to West Perth was sufficient proof of the locality of the suburb and of its interests being joined to those of Perth. He had many amendments to move to the schedule so as to add one or two more electorates to the Metropolitan Province. He supported the amendment.

Amendment (to add Subiaco to the Metropolitan Province) put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	...	...	...	8
Noes	...	...	...	19

Majority against	...	11
------------------	-----	----

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Bath	Mr. Butcher
Mr. Daglish	Mr. Diamond
Mr. Gordon	Mr. Ferguson
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Foulkes
Mr. Moran	Mr. Gardiner
Mr. Purkiss	Mr. Gregory
Mr. Thomas	Mr. Hassell
Mr. Taylor (Teller).	Mr. Hastie
	Mr. Hopkins
	Mr. Jacoby
	Mr. James
	Mr. Phillips
	Mr. Piesse
	Mr. Pigott
	Mr. Reason
	Mr. Smith
	Mr. Wallace
	Mr. Yelverton
	Mr. Higham (Teller).

Amendment thus negatived.

MR. THOMAS moved that progress be reported.

THE PREMIER: Finish the first schedule.

MR. THOMAS: A matter of this sort could not possibly be dealt with in one sitting. To this schedule he had several amendments.

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

Ayes	...	...	6
Noes	...	...	21

Majority against ... 15

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Bath	Mr. Butcher
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Daglish
Mr. Moran	Mr. Diamond
Mr. Purkiss	Mr. Ferguson
Mr. Taylor	Mr. Foulkes
Mr. Thomas (Teller).	Mr. Gardiner
	Mr. Gordon
	Mr. Gregory
	Mr. Hassell
	Mr. Hayward
	Mr. Hopkins
	Mr. Jacoby
	Mr. James
	Mr. Phillips
	Mr. Piesse
	Mr. Pigott
	Mr. Rason
	Mr. Smith
	Mr. Wallace
	Mr. Yelverton
	Mr. Higham (Teller).

Motion thus negatived.

MR. DAGLISH: The Premier had accepted his amendment, yet Ministers voted against it.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: The Premier had made to the hon. member a certain promise, which would be carried out.

MR. TEESDALE SMITH: Could there be farther discussion on the schedule, seeing that the last word therein, "Subiaco," had been dealt with?

THE CHAIRMAN: That word had not been considered, except consequentially in respect of the amendment.

MR. MORAN: Was the member for Subiaco satisfied that the Bill would be recommended?

THE PREMIER: The alteration suggested would be made.

MR. MORAN: The Premier had wasted the whole of yesterday afternoon, last night, and this morning, by his refusal to take an ordinary common-sense view of the position.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question was that the schedule stand as printed.

[7 o'clock, a.m.]

MR. MORAN would rather vote against the schedule altogether. The amendment proposed to give to the Upper House three members for a population of 24,000, taking the basis as laid down for the Legislative Assembly.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member was now obstructing, and if he persisted he (the Chairman) would have to act accordingly.

MR. MORAN: There was no attempt at obstruction. He was speaking against the proposal to give three members to 24,000 people, while three members were given to Gascoyne, Kimberley, Pilbarra and Roebourne. Surely he could discuss that?

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member would be allowed to discuss that.

MR. MORAN: Nothing more was being done than what had occurred in the Federal Parliament, where time after time members had spoken for hours on the disfranchising of people, and surely he would be allowed to speak for a few moments. In the electorate of Gascoyne, Kimberley, Pilbarra, and Roebourne there was a population of 2,405, and these people would have three members, while 24,000 people in the Metropolitan district were to have three members only. He did not so much object to giving Gascoyne, Kimberley, Pilbarra and Roebourne three members; there were special reasons why the North should receive special treatment; but he objected to Albany, Beverley, Katanning and the Williams receiving three members. If he thought he could win justice for the people of Perth in the matter of distribution he would be willing to stay without a wink of sleep for three days. Something had already been won from the Premier which was a promise to recommit the Bill, and if the Premier recommitted the Bill for purposes of his own, there was no reason why the schedule could not be discussed as a whole. The whole question would be reopened.

MR. PIGOTT: After the admission of the Premier that he had consented and had given a promise that the Bill would be recommitted—

THE PREMIER: Not the Bill; just that alteration.

MR. PIGOTT moved, as a protest against the action of the Premier, that progress be reported.

**THE PREMIER:** There was no objection. Motion passed, and progress reported.

**MR. MORAN:** The conduct of the House having been taken out of the hands of the Government, did the Premier propose to reconsider his position?

#### ADJOURNMENT.

**THE PREMIER** moved that the House at its rising do adjourn until half-past 7 o'clock this (Wednesday) evening.

**MR. MORAN:** It was his intention to enter a protest against adjourning until half-past 7. He was prepared to be in his place at half-past 4. Members had brought the Government to their knees at last, and if members were prepared to be here at half-past 4, the business of the House should be gone on with at that hour. There should be no adjournment until half-past 7, as it meant delaying the business. What was the use of putting forth our best efforts to have a fight on this matter, if members were not prepared to come back at the usual hour?

**MR. TAYLOR** called attention to the state of the House.

Bells rung and quorum formed.

**MR. PIGOTT:** In fairness to the Premier, he would like to state that he suggested to the hon. gentleman some time ago that the House should adjourn until half-past 7, and for that very reason he must support him in his motion that the House adjourn until that time.

**MR. MORAN:** Why did not the leader of the Opposition say that this arrangement had been entered into? The Premier obstinately refused a recommendation, and now there was some understanding between both sides of the House. He did not know whether it was part of a general understanding.

**MR. PIGOTT:** If the hon. member would sit down he would explain.

**MR. MORAN:** The hon. member could not speak again. If, however, he wished to make a personal explanation, he (Mr. Moran) would sit down. His contention was that we might, with justice, have come back here at half-past 4 and gone on with the work. If there were sufficient members in the House who felt like he did they would fight the Bill at every stage, and fight it vigorously and strenuously. We had a whole lot of work to go through this session. We

had the Budget proposals of the Government, and everything else. He was not here to stonewall or to object to the understanding arrived at by both sides of the House, except to say that he did not think these understandings should be so readily entered into. The House ought to meet at half-past 4.

**MR. PIGOTT:** With regard to the nasty insinuation thrown out by the member for West Perth about his having approached the Premier with regard to the adjournment of the House being part of a proposed compact, he denied that absolutely. He spoke to the Premier on this matter in the ordinary way which might be expected of him at any time. He thought that members had done enough work for the present, and that the respite from now to half-past 7 was well deserved.

**MR. MORAN:** An arrangement of this sort should be notified to all sides of the House.

Question (adjournment to 7:30) passed, and the House adjourned at 7:14 a.m. until the evening.

### Legislative Council, Wednesday, 9th September, 1903.

	PAGE
Urgency Motion: Kimberley Leases, Mr. Copley ...	904
Questions: Rabbit-proof Netting for Settlers ...	907
Land Applications, Priority ...	907
Liquor License, Boulder ...	907
Motion: Agricultural and Pastoral Settlement, Great Southern District ...	907
Bills: Audit, Recommittal (suggestions) ...	909
Lunacy, Recommittal, progress ...	910
Noxious Weeds, in Committee resumed, progress ...	910
Pearlshell Fishery Act Amendment, second reading moved ...	912
Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Act Amendment, second reading ...	914
Picture of the King ...	916

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

#### PRAYERS.

#### URGENCY MOTION—KIMBERLEY LEASES, MR. COPLEY.

**HON. W. MALEY** (South-East): I desire to move the adjournment of the