

## ADJOURNMENT.

The Council, at ten minutes to nine o'clock, p.m., adjourned until Thursday, 8th August, at half-past four o'clock, p.m.

## Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 7th August, 1895.

*Personal Explanation—Traffic on Northam-Southern Cross Railway—Construction of East Perth Railway Station—The W.A. Timber Company's Tramway and Land Resumptions—The W.A. Timber Company's Sawmills and Tramway—Incidental Expenses (miscellaneous services); Excesses on 1894-95 Estimates, and reasons for such—Proposed Redistribution of Parliamentary Seats—Justices Appointment Bill: Message from the Legislative Council—Appointment of Joint Committee re Mines Regulation Bill: Message from the Legislative Council—Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Bill: in committee—Railway and Theatre Refreshment Rooms Licensing Bill: second reading—Arbitration Bill: in committee—Criminal Evidence Bill: in committee—Adjournment.*

THE SPEAKER took the chair at 4.30 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

MR. RANDELL: I rise, Sir, to make a few remarks before the business of the day is commenced. It is generally understood that I have sent in my resignation of the position of leader of the members sitting on this side of the House, and it has been kindly accepted. I take this opportunity of thanking hon. members on both sides of the House for the kindly consideration I have received at their hands during the period in which I have acted in that capacity. I understand the hon. member for Albany has been elected to that position, and he will now act as leader, I presume, of those members who sit on this side of the House.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I should like to say how much I regret that the hon. member for Perth has thought it necessary and advisable to resign the position of leader of the Opposition. During the time he has occupied the position, he has only carried out his duties in the way in which we knew he would carry them out. The hon. member, as is well known in this country, has served a long apprenticeship to public affairs; and, when he was elected to the position he has now vacated, we in this House knew that, whatever he might lend himself to, or take part in, he would be actuated by high and patriotic motives. I can only express the regret of myself, and I am sure also of the members on this side of the House, that he has thought it necessary to vacate the position which he has occupied with credit to himself, and credit to the country.

## TRAFFIC ON NORTHAM-SOUTHERN CROSS RAILWAY.

MR. MONGER, without notice, asked the Commissioner of Railways to state when it was intended to lay on the table the return recently moved for by the hon. member for Yilgarn, showing the amount of traffic on the Northam-Southern Cross Railway.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn) replied that he had seen the return, which had taken some time in preparation, on account of the great scope of the requirements set forth in the motion of the hon. member for Yilgarn. The return would be laid on the table almost immediately.

## CONSTRUCTION OF EAST PERTH RAILWAY STATION.

MR. JAMES, in accordance with notice, asked the Director of Public Works when tenders would be called for the erection of the East Perth railway station.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) replied that tenders would not be called, as the construction of the platform was now in progress.

## W.A. TIMBER COMPANY'S TRAMWAY AND LAND RESUMPTION.

MR. COOKWORTHY, in accordance with notice, asked the Premier whether it was the intention of the Government to return to the former owners the land resumed by the Government for the purposes of the W.A.

Timber Company's tramway, situated between the Busselton-Boyanup Railway and the sea coast.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) replied that, should it be finally decided that the land referred to would not be required for the purposes for which it was resumed, the Government would be glad to view favorably the proposal to return the land to the former owners.

#### THE W.A. TIMBER COMPANY'S SAWMILLS AND TRAMWAY.

MR. COOKWORTHY, in accordance with notice, asked the Premier whether the Government intended to put in working order the sawmills and tramway lately purchased from the W. A. Timber Company.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) replied that the Government had this matter under consideration, and intended to invite offers from persons willing to work the sawmills on a long lease—say for 21 years.

#### INCIDENTAL EXPENSES.—MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES.

MR. R. F. SHOLL, in accordance with notice, moved for a detailed return showing in what manner, and for what purpose, the sum of £3,000 voted by Parliament for the year ending 30th June, 1895 (under Miscellaneous Services, sub-head 5, Incidental Expenses) has been expended, or any portion thereof. If the said sum of £3,000 has been exceeded, the return to show the amount of the excess, and the services for which the money has been expended.

Question put and passed.

#### EXCESSES ON ESTIMATES 1894-5, AND REASONS FOR SUCH.

MR. R. F. SHOLL, in accordance with notice, moved for a return showing in detail all excesses on votes embodied in the Estimates (under the different sub-heads) for the year ending 30th June, 1895, with the departmental explanation for such excesses. He said all he required was a return showing the amount of the excess in the expenditure under the different votes that had been exceeded, with marginal notes giving the departmental reasons for the excess in each case.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) replied that he thoroughly understood the hon. member's wants in this matter. The hon.

member wanted, in fact, the Excess Bill to be supplied in this return. All the particulars asked for in the motion would be given in the Excess Bill when it could be brought in. Some of the information could be supplied at once from the Treasury books. He might point out to hon. members that they received some information at the present time which members did not receive last year—certainly not on the estimates—namely, that the present form of the printed Estimates showed the expenditure for the year on every item, so that hon. members would now be able to see at a glance how much any item of expenditure had been exceeded during the past year. The present form of the Estimates showed not only the amount of every vote, but the amount expended under each vote during the past financial year, as well as the amount of the vote proposed for the current year. Therefore he must take exception to the hon. member's statement that information on this point was not placed before the House. The form of the printed Estimates showed whether the expenditure under any vote of the past year had been kept within the amount or exceeded; also whether any particular item was underdrawn or overdrawn, this being shown all through the Estimates. This was information very valuable to hon. members, and, in fact, was all they required in dealing with the items, because they could see exactly whether the votes of last year had been exceeded or not. The information which the hon. member had moved for now would be of no use to the House, so far as showing the reasons why any particular vote had been exceeded. All the information asked for in the hon. member's first motion would relate to those sums which were voted in a lump, to be expended by the Government as might be found necessary. Still, he (the Premier) saw no objection to supplying to information which the hon. member now asked for, and the Treasury would endeavor to obtain from the departments the reasons for the excess in each case, and place them before the House. So far as the Treasury was concerned, the information it possessed could be readily supplied; but, as to getting the departments to give their reasons for the excess in each case, that must take some time for making up this return, as it generally took some time for the Treasury to get the information when requiring it.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said printed Estimates

did not show the reasons for the excess expenditure on the different items. Under the Miscellaneous vote, for instance, a lump sum was given, but not the particulars. [THE PREMIER: That is the only instance.] However, by getting this information supplied now, hon. members would be able to deal with the excess expenditure when considering the year's Estimates, instead of having to wait till a later period for the Excess Bill, which dealt with excesses that, in some cases, were eighteen months or nearly two years old. The information asked for in this return would do away with the absurdity of having to consider excesses that were eighteen months old. He thanked the Premier for promising to try and supply the information.

Question put and passed.

#### PROPOSED REDISTRIBUTION OF SEATS.

MR. ILLINGWORTH, in accordance with notice, moved "That the decision of the Government in reference to the question of redistribution of seats is not satisfactory to this House; and is not in harmony with the expressed desire of the mining districts, nor is it in accord with the opinion of the majority of the people of this colony." He said: It is to me a matter of regret that it should be necessary for any hon. members to frame motions in the way in which this motion is framed, in order to induce the Government to take those steps for the advancement of this country that the people of the country demand. I take it that the Government should lead this House and also lead the country, and that they should not wait to be spurred on by public opinion from without, or by motions of this House from within. To me it seems that it is calculated to bring Parliament into contempt when the Government can allow motions such as have been moved in this House during this session to come before the House, and to treat them, if not with silence, at least with a want of that consideration which is customary in the case of motions of this kind in Parliaments elsewhere.

THE PREMIER: When did we do that?

MR. ILLINGWORTH: However, that is a matter for the Government themselves to settle. It is not for me or hon. members in this House to instruct the Government in the way they are to conduct the business of the country in this House; but it is quite in order, I take it, for any hon. member to express his opinion in this manner, as to the conduct of

that business. When I took the opportunity of speaking in the debate on the Address-in-Reply, I urged upon the Government and upon this House the absolute necessity for a redistribution of seats in the colony, in order that there might be equitable representation, and I at that time placed before the House certain figures which I conceived to be sufficient to call the attention, and arouse the interest of the Ministry itself, of this House, and of the whole country upon this matter. I allowed some considerable time to pass, when I again called the attention of the Government to the subject by asking in this House whether it was the intention of the Government to take any steps in this direction, and, as will be seen by the printed Votes and Proceedings, No. 10, on July 9th, I received an answer from the Treasury bench, which is therein recorded, that the Government did not propose to deal with this question at present. Now I want to lay before the House, on this question, a few facts, and to lay down, as a basis of contention, a few main principles. An old-fashioned principle in politics—in modern days, at least—is that there should be no taxation without representation. Then, looking at the taxation in this colony for the last year, for the purpose of my argument, I find that for the last quarter of the year we collected through the Customs—that is direct taxation through the Customs, exclusive altogether of our trading concerns, such as the railways, post office, land, etc.—a sum of £559,740. Judging from the prospect which lies before us, we may reasonably expect that in the succeeding year—the year upon which we have entered—the taxation through the Customs will reach not less than £650,000. Now, supposing our population rises during the year to 100,000, that will mean that we are collecting from the people of this colony, through the Custom-house alone, a sum averaging £6 10s per head. Hon. members must be aware of the fact that this taxation, through the Customs-house at any rate, is much greater per head than in any other portion of Australia. It is more than double the proportion that is collected in most of the colonies. And the question presents itself—if there is to be proper representation upon the basis of population, if the people who provide this money and are taxed at the rate of £6 10s. per head through the Customs alone, and who place in the hands of the Government of the day about

£1,200,000 a year, without referring to loan moneys—that the people should have some voice in the expenditure of these moneys, and that there should be something like equitable representation in reference to the members who sit in this House. Taking, however, the real figures brought to book, we have for the last year ending June 30th no less a sum than £513,508 received. The population is less than 90,000, but, reckoning it at 90,000, the average amount collected would be over £5 10s. per head. This is a very large amount of taxation to take through the Custom-house, yet the people are subscribing this amount in direct taxation. Then we find that the adult male population, based upon the Registrar-General's return, is something like 38,000 in round numbers. I stated on a former occasion that these 38,000 grown men—because I take it that we should look at the question of representation from the point of view of the number of adult males there are in the colony—therefore taking the population on the goldfields, I am satisfied that I am not exceeding the figures in saying 20,000 out of the 38,000 male adults are upon our goldfields. I repeat what I said on the Address-in-Reply, that the Ministry itself represents in this House 552 electors, and that eleven members, or one-third of this House, sit for 887 electors. But I want to add, as another point, that the hon. member for West Perth sits for 1,859 electors.

THE PREMIER: How many do you sit for?

MR. ILLINGWORTH: It is not a question of the number I sit for—that is the trouble—but a question of what number I ought to sit for—men who ought to have votes, and who would have votes if there were a proper system of making up the electoral roll. I am prepared to test the question in my constituency against the Hon. the Premier, at any rate. Surely 11 members of this House, sitting for 887 voters, the Ministry sitting for 552 voters, and the hon. member for West Perth sitting for 1,859 voters—surely there is nothing like fair representation here! There are 17 members in this House—a majority of the whole—who sit for 3,519 voters. If we look at the southern portion of the colony, we have nine members for the south—all good men and true, and the Premier at the head of them—who sit for 2,944 voters. Before I pass from these figures, I ask the House to consider the fact that the voters in the south practically represent the voting power.

They are not persons who come and go, and most of them are on the roll. A large proportion of those adult males in the south are on the roll, and consequently they have the opportunity of voting. Comparing these with Perth city—which has 947 on the roll, East Perth 1196, and West Perth 1859, making a total of 3002 voters, who have three members—we find that in the south 2,944 voters have nine representatives. Now my desire is not to reduce the representation of the north; but I desire to increase the membership of this House in order that there may be fair representation of other parts of the colony. I want also to state before I go further, that the question of altering the Constitution must not be allowed to enter into this matter, because this country is now beginning to assume a new life, and as the changes continue, and districts become settled, it will be necessary to make frequent alterations in the Constitution in this particular. If 20,000 people settle in the north or in any other part of the colony, it is but reasonable that they shall have fair representation, and if it be necessary to alter the Constitution, it will be quite in order to do so. I shall only be too glad of the opportunity to alter the Constitution in this respect, every year, because if the influx of population and increase of settlement be such as to justify such a course of action, it will show that we are progressing. Now we come to Fremantle and we find that there are 511 votes in Central Fremantle, 799 in North Fremantle, and 927 in South Fremantle, making a total of 2,237 voters, who have three members, while the southern portion of the colony, with 2,944 voters, is represented by nine members. If it comes to a question of area, I should say that the whole area of the south is not greater than the area of the district which I represent. If it should be a question of wealth, I question whether the south is very much more wealthy than the north.

THE PREMIER: The wealth is underground in the north.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Yes, and so is most of the wealth of the south, and it will take a great deal more money to acquire it, than it will to get it out of the Murchison. I ask the House to notice another phase of this question. The Census Returns show that in 1891 there were 18,350 adult males in the colony. At that time two-thirds, or 13,000 of these, were located in the south and south west. On March 31, 1895, it was estimate

that there were 38,000 adult males in the colony. This shows an increase of 20,000 in four years. Now, where are these 20,000?

MR. FORREST: A good many are in Perth and Fremantle.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: A good many who were there are now on the goldfields, and more men have gone there than have remained in those centres.

MR. FORREST: Oh no!

MR. ILLINGWORTH: The hon. member will have an opportunity of relating these facts at the proper time. Suppose we add to the 18,350 adult males already settled in 1891, a natural increase of one-third, which would be 6,113. This would make 24,463 for the whole colony exclusive of the goldfields, leaving the fields with, at the very lowest estimate, a population of 3,539.

MR. MORAN: There are 13,000 on the Yilgarn field alone.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: The hon. member for Yilgarn knows we can afford to be liberal in this matter. When I say there are 13,539 able-bodied men on the goldfields, I am, at least, 5,000 below the mark; but I am prepared to argue this question on the basis that the goldfields have only a population of 13,539. Assuming that those figures are correct, I ask—How are those 13,539 able-bodied men represented?

MR. FORREST: They are represented by the whole of the House.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: That is a left-handed way of arguing. According to that, hon. members who sit for the goldfields, represent Perth as well. I am surprised to hear the hon. member use such an argument. In the present House three goldfields' members sit for 1,162, or one for every 386 on the roll; seven northern members sit for 365, or one for every 50 on the roll; seven central members sit for 1,890, or one for every 240 on the roll; and sixteen south and south-west members sit for 8,466, or one for every 529. Thus, it will be seen that seven northern members represent 365 persons who were on the roll at the time of their election; seven central members represent 2,800; 16 southern members represent 8,466, and the goldfields' members represent 1,162 voters, when the number should really be 13,539.

MR. FORREST: That is not fair. They can get on the roll.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: If they were on the roll we would not have to discuss the question.

Now, if the goldfields had 16 members, their representation would then only be equal to that of the present representation of the South and south-west, at the rate of one member for every 845 voters.

THE PREMIER: You are under-rating the south and over-rating the north. There are hundreds of people who are not on the roll.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I am now quoting the male population of the colony, and that is the basis upon which I am proceeding. Supposing these 13,539 men on the fields had their representatives at the rate of one member for every 100 men, which the north has, they would have 135 members; if they had one for every 400, which the central districts have, they would have 33 members; and if they had one for every 845, which the south and south-west have, they would have 16 members.

MR. FORREST: Mr. Speaker, is the hon. member in order in leading the House to believe that people who are not on the roll should have further representation.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. member is in order.

MR. FORREST: He is not stating facts.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I do not think the hon. member for West Kimberley can educate me in Parliamentary procedure.

MR. GEORGE: I should like to know, Sir, if the hon. member for West Kimberley is in order in stating that the hon. member for Nannine is not stating facts.

THE SPEAKER: I was asked if the hon. member for Nannine was in order, and I have stated that he was.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Supposing we fix the basis of representation at one member for 1,000 males, the goldfields would want 13 members; if it were fixed at one for every 1,500 they would be entitled to 9, and if at one for every 2,000, they should have seven representatives in this House.

MR. FORREST: They are not on the roll.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: The hon. member cannot appreciate an argument when he hears one. It is not my fault if he has not studied logic. Reverting to my first argument now, Sir, that the true and equitable basis of representation is the basis of taxation, I contend that the 13,000, 15,000, or 20,000 persons as the case may be, who pay, say £5 per head through the Customs, are therefore contributing £100,000 in revenue through this channel alone.

MR. MORAN: They pay more.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: We can afford to be liberal. In addition to this £100,000 they pay for miners' rights and for other privileges, and I ask if there is anything like fair representation when only three members can sit? There is a newspaper which takes every opportunity to support this Government, and a recent article therein claimed that there should be five members for the Murchison upon the following basis:—"Nannine, Star of the East, Peake Hill, Horseshoe, Lawler's and Doyles, 950 electors, one member; Cue, Cuddingwarra and Day Dawn, 2,000 electors, two members; The Island, Mainland and Mt. Magnet, 1,000 electors, one member; and Yalgoo, Melville and other adjacent districts, 800 electors, one member." Surely the first lot of 950 is as much entitled to one member, as Perth is with its 947 electors. Then again, taking Perth as a standard, the 2,000 electors of Cue and neighbourhood are entitled to two members, and the other two districts mentioned should have one each. That will give the Murchison five members.

MR. FORREST: Too much.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Of course it would be too much for the hon. member.

MR. FORREST: I said five were too much for the Murchison.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I am satisfied that the Nannine district has one member too many for this Ministry, and they will find it out before long. Now supposing these figures be reduced by one half, or by a little more than one half, we should then be entitled to three members, and I am sure if that contention applies to the Murchison district it also applies to the Yilgarn district, and consequently, in advocating this reform, I am not applying a parochial idea to the question; but as this country advances, the people who are taxed must have fair representation, otherwise very serious results must necessarily follow. At the least 5,000 voters have sent to this House a clear majority, who are spending the whole of the taxation of the people; and I do ask the House to consider whether it is a fair, righteous and equitable distribution, whether it is in harmony with the great principle of democratic Government which is, there should be no taxation without representation, that there should be out of 38,000 able-bodied men in this colony, less than 5,000 voters represented by a majority of the House who can spend the whole of

the taxation, besides loan money, and load the country with loans which future generations will have to pay.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is for the benefit of the goldfields.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I admit that; but if you allow the railways on the goldfields to have their fair share, and if you lay aside the revenue derived from the goldfields, the railways will not cost much. If every shilling spent upon the fields is debited against them, and every shilling obtained therefrom is credited to them, it will be found that they will have a credit balance.

MR. FORREST: Let them wait awhile.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Yes, long enough to suit the hon. member for West Kimberley.

MR. FORREST: It is coming.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: We know it is; you cannot stop it, and if this discussion is carried on in a straightforward manner, as I expect it will be, it will provide a stepping stone towards the settlement of this question upon an equitable basis. I do not ask that there should be anything like the representation which the figures I have quoted would demand; but I do ask that there shall be such a redistribution of seats as shall give something like equitable representation, not only to the goldfields, but to other centres. I believe Perth and Fremantle are equitably entitled to further representation; and I think that in all fairness we should, if we accept the basis of argument used in latter day politics, that there shall be no taxation without representation, give those who are toiling and laboring to bring this colony to the high position which it is destined to take, and are paying heavy taxation, the right to vote and send representatives to this House. Is it fair or just, or within the range of what is called British fair-play, that such a state of things should exist as they do at present? They are worse than those which existed in Great Britain before the passing of the Reform Bill, and here, in the 19th century, we have gone back to those conditions. I sincerely ask hon. members to face this question and give justice to all people, whether they are on the goldfields or anywhere else.

MR. WOOD: Honorable members of this House, Mr. Speaker, do not appear disposed to tackle the question submitted by the hon. member for Nannine. I must confess at the outset that the hon. member has placed this matter before the House in a very able

manner, and he has dealt most fully with the subject. I think he deserves a great deal of credit for the way he has got up the figures to support his arguments. Whether those figures are correct or not I do not pretend to say, but I fancy there must be a good deal of guesswork about them, and they can only be approximate. At the same time, I say he has placed this subject before us in a very able way indeed. To my mind there is a good deal in what he says as to the representation of the goldfields in this House, but I have risen, Mr. Speaker, to say that, despite this fact, I intend to vote against the motion, and I will do that simply because I do not believe that the time has yet arrived when a redistribution of seats is necessary.

MR. MORAN: When is the time?

MR. WOOD: The hon. member for Yilgarn is always in too great a hurry. I say that the time has not arrived, in my opinion, when we should grant these further concessions to the goldfields. There can be no doubt that the hon. member for Nannine is only fulfilling his duty to the constituency he represents, when he seeks to secure for it additional representation in this House. So far as those to be benefited are concerned, the hon. member for Nannine speaks as though they came here and discovered the gold. As a matter of fact, had the gold not already been discovered, we should never have seen them. They only came here when the other colonies were played out, and they were in search of occupation. If the goldfields failed here these people would leave us just as quickly as they came. Some will never be here to vote.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: You will not let them vote. I have no vote myself, simply because I have moved out of one electoral district into another.

MR. WOOD: As far as the question of time is concerned, I think the proper time when we should discuss the redistribution of seats will be towards the end of the next session, and a motion of this sort, if submitted then, will have my support. To carry this resolution now means a general election, and none of the members in the House want that. It is only last year that we had one, and I do not want another just yet, not that I have any fear of my own constituents, for the reason that when I do not give them satisfaction I suppose I shall be able to gracefully take a back seat. If this motion is submitted during the next session, or prior to a general election, I will

support it. I have every sympathy for the hon. members for Nannine and Yilgarn, for they have been forced into this resolution by pressure on the part of their constituents. They must be worried out of their lives by the pressure exercised, and every day must be one of misery for them. Although the hon. member for Nannine sits in opposition to me in this House, I hope his present action will be fully justified by the electors he is seeking to assist. I have only spoken at this stage because other hon. members seemed to be disinclined to tackle the subject. I cannot support the motion at the present time, but I will do so at a later stage of this Parliament. I believe, myself, that the electorate of West Perth is entitled to greater representation, but the great demand for these reforms has only sprung up since last year. There has been a wonderful development and great changes, and, while I agree with the hon. member for Nannine that we should keep pace with those changes, I do not believe the present is an opportune time to carry out a scheme for the redistribution of seats.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I regret very much that the hon. member for Nannine has thought fit to bring this motion forward, for the reason that he knows very well, and no one better than he, that he cannot possibly expect to carry it. It is possible that what the hon. member for West Perth said is true, and that was that the reason for the motion is to enable the hon. member for Nannine to keep pace with the feelings and wishes of his constituents. Possibly they are constantly worrying him. Personally I do not think so. I do not believe that people who are engaged in the eager search for gold have any thought of their votes at all. They are too busy in looking after their mining interests. You always find that when people get crowded together there are a number of them who think they should have much more than they have got, and now they want greater representation. Now, Sir, this question was first raised by the hon. member for Nannine when he asked me on July 9th "Whether it was the intention of the Government to bring in a Bill to amend the Constitution Act by providing for such a redistribution of seats as would give more equitable representation in this House to the goldfields and other centres of population," I do not think my reply, on that occasion, was at all indefinite, when I said that the Govern-

ment did not propose to deal with this question at present. The hon. member states that after this reply he has given the Government reasonable time before he has brought the subject forward again. That question was on July 9th, and this is August 7th. I do not know what the hon. member does call reasonable time. He knows perfectly well that the Government has not, and never had, any intention of dealing with this subject at the present time. If we had had any such intention he knows full well that it would have been so stated in the Speech of the Acting-Governor. However, in the face of this he now comes forward and moves what is tantamount to a motion of want of confidence in the Ministry. He knows the meaning of his words, and that they can only bear this interpretation.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I never said they did not. I say it is a want of confidence motion.

THE PREMIER: And I suppose you expect to carry it.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I do not.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Of course the hon. member has no idea of carrying this resolution. He never expected that it could be carried. His only desire is to keep himself well before the public and the country, and his constituents in particular. It seems to me that the hon. member for Nannine, notwithstanding his protests, is sometimes desirous of keeping himself well before the public and his constituents, no matter what injury he may do, or how much he may hamper the Government. So long as he can oppose and place obstacles in the way of the Government he appears to be pleased.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: That is what I am here for. I was returned to oppose the Forrest Government.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I do not think that is so. I am sure the hundred people who elected the hon. member had no such desire when they returned him to this House. The hon. member has produced some very elaborate figures here to-night, and he is always ready to twit other hon. members with only representing a small number of electors, but he should not forget that he only represents one hundred electors, and I do not believe that all of these voted for him at the last election.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: They did; and at any rate I was elected by more than you were.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest):

Only about one hundred electors returned the hon. member. I was returned by three times that number, because I had no opposition. I was supported by every elector in my constituency. Every member who sits on the front Ministerial Bench can say the same thing. They were all elected without opposition. The same thing applies to other hon. members of this House who sit on this side, and the hon. member for Nannine has therefore nothing to boast about in his paltry hundred. I desire to say this, and I speak this way, because I am perfectly tired of the class of argument the hon. member is continually bringing forward. He is too fond of saying there are so many people in one part of the colony and so many more in another, while I doubt not, if he does get what he wants, the voters will cast their votes for him. There is another thing I want to say and that is that I am much amused at the conceit he shows. I do not wish to use the word offensively, but it does amuse me to see the conceit he displays. Whenever you cross him in an argument, or disagree with him in anything, he is very fond of offering to go before the electors with whoever differs from him. Well, Sir, I may say at once that I have not the slightest intention of going up to Nannine, but I will say that, if he comes to Bunbury, while I will not guarantee to beat him, I will promise him a warm run. The motion presented by the hon. member is altogether inopportune. It is only a year ago since the hon. member himself and the representatives of Yilgarn and the Pilbarra fields were elected. It is only a year since the change of Constitution, and since the privileges now enjoyed, and upon which the hon. members were elected, were assented to by this very House without a dissentient voice. These privileges were brought forward by this very Government. They were granted by the House most cheerfully. The hon. member says that he would change the Constitution every year. For my part I say that the less we tinker with our Constitution Act the better it will be. It is only a year ago since three members were given to the goldfields, and they already want more. To say that the House is not in sympathy with the people who are on the goldfields, simply because it will not pass this motion, is ridiculous. I am quite as much in sympathy with them as the hon. members who represent them. There is hardly a single person in this House who is not most anxious to see our great goldfields fully developed. Very few



of them are not materially interested in their progress, and not a single member would dream of expressing a wish to interfere in any way. Why should he change the Constitution at this stage? The first elections under it were only a year ago, and the hon. member is pressing on a motion of want of confidence, for the simple reason that we do not see our way clear to amend it this year also. What is the reason for this? Can anyone say that the goldfields have been neglected in any way whatever? I deny any such thing. We are doing our very best to assist them in every way, and we are doing it cheerfully. The House is giving us its cheerful assent as well. We recognise that our goldfields are important, that they are ours, and that it is our duty and our privilege to develop what is our own property. I cannot see any reason why the hon. member for Nannine should bring this forward in the shape of a want of confidence motion, more particularly when it is recollected that we gave his electors the very votes by which they returned him to this House. No one is more willing to extend the privileges enjoyed by electors at present than I am, but the present is not an opportune time to deal with the question. There is no reason whatever at the present moment for the change in the Constitution Act that it is proposed should be made. The hon. member who introduced this motion has presented us with a lot of figures, and he has followed a good plan of arriving at his own results. So far as his figures for the southern districts are concerned, however, I do not believe his figures are reliable. I question his statement, for I know there must be hundreds entitled to vote who are not on the rolls.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: My figures are not as to the number on the roll, but are based on the population of the district.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): That may be so, but I know as a matter of fact that there are a great number of persons in the settled portions of this colony who are not on the rolls. The hon. member was very careful not to state that fact. Those who have no votes are those who have been no time in the colony. It is no use to say that the time required is too long. The period fixed—12 months' residence—is based on the Electoral Act of the colony from which the people, and the hon. member himself, have come. Is it to be said that this period is unreasonable? It must be recollected that the agitation against

the present Constitution comes from the newly settled portions of the colony. This is a moving population, and many of the people in these districts have only been in the colony a very short time. It is quite possible that notwithstanding this they want the franchise at once, and with it all the powers and privileges the more settled portions of the colony have a right to. Whenever the hon. member for Nannine refers to the people of the southern districts he does so with a sneer. He pretends to regard them as different from other people, but they are the people who have been settled in the colony for years, and who have their interests here, and they are the people who are certainly more entitled to a voice in the affairs of the country than are the people who have just come here. Our Constitution Act provides for twelve months' residence, and I, for one, do not think it is too long. I do not believe that people come to this country for the purpose of voting. They come here to make a fortune, and if they take my advice they will apply themselves in that direction instead of running after the franchise or getting on the roll. Personally I want to see every man on the roll, but I do not think the provision of twelve months' residence in the colony and six months in the electoral district is a bit too long. The Electoral Act we propose to introduce will make the methods of voting much easier. It will simplify the means of getting on the roll, and will do away with difficulties and obstacles which are quite unintentional in the present Act. There is no desire on our part not to keep pace with the times, but to keep tinkering with the Constitution Act year by year would not only be foolish, but exceedingly mischievous as well. The motion by the hon. member for Nannine is not presented with the idea that it will be carried. He admits that himself. It is only an electioneering dodge, so that he can go to his constituents and say, "I asked a question of the Premier and I received this reply. I moved a motion, and the House would not agree with me. Not one of the members of that House is any good. I am the only good man there." I disagree with this sort of motions, and I believe the time is rapidly approaching when hon. members of this House will refuse to put up with them. The hon. member knows perfectly well that the Government have already stated that they do not intend to do anything with this question this session.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: You said that about the Education Question, but you did do something.

THE PREMIER (Hon Sir J. Forrest): That was only done at the desire of the House. There is no desire on the part of hon. members that we should deal with this question. The hon. member for Nannine tells us that he was sent here to annoy and obstruct the Government of this colony as much as possible. If this is his duty to his constituents then he is carrying out his duty most thoroughly.

MR. MORAN: Mr. Speaker, I think the Premier was rather unjust in his references to the hon. member for Nannine and the motives of that gentleman in bringing this matter forward. I am not going into the elaborate heroics anticipated of me by the hon. member for West Perth. I do not think that any one can accuse me of trying to thwart the Government in any way, but this motion is the unanimous wish of the large constituency I represent. If the hon. member for Nannine is guilty of any offence for doing his duty to his constituents, then I must be considered equally guilty. This matter has been forced upon me by all sections of my constituents, and by the representatives of all bodies, corporate or otherwise, existing on the field. I am aware that numerous petitions have been forwarded to the Premier praying for a redistribution of seats, and with not one of these petitions have I had anything to do. The people who are on the goldfields have a right to Parliamentary representation, for the reason that they have expended an enormous amount of capital there, they have settled there, and the population generally is of a permanent class. The time will soon arrive when these people should be granted the franchise. I do not think that the hon. member for Nannine wants a dissolution of this House. I would not support him in that, for the simple reason that it would interfere too greatly with the progress of the public works policy now being carried out, but when this has been completed, say in about six months' time, this redistribution of seats must take place. I would have liked to hear the Premier assure the House that the question would be dealt with at some time, even if it was twelve months. Any assurance of that sort, I am sure, would be regarded as satisfactory. The hon. member who introduced this subject quoted a number of figures showing what the representation of the goldfields should

be, but if the basis of calculation was carried out there would be more than enough members from Yilgarn alone to fill this chamber. It will be seen that such an arrangement would be untenable, but I apprehend that when an hon. member is addressing a House he knows to be unfavorable to his proposition, he must make the best use of his figures. For my own part, I propose to take a medium course, and that is to say that we should have four members for Yilgarn, and that there should be two for Nannine. At the present time there are four goldfields in my electorate, four Wardens, and four mining courts. I believe there should also be four representatives in Parliament. That would give the goldfields eight members altogether, and no one can say that is too much. It has been suggested that the people of the goldfields are opposed to the Forrest Ministry, but that I altogether deny. I know that when I was elected the people rather favored the Ministry, and that feeling has rather increased than decreased since then. The people of the goldfields recognise and appreciate the splendid work done in their interests by the Forrest Ministry in developing the fields, and in giving them public works, railways, and postal facilities. I believe that if the extension of the franchise was granted now, and there was a general election to-morrow, a majority of members returned from the goldfields would give an independent support to the Forrest Government. For myself I have always given the Government an independent support. I entered the House to follow certain principles, and from these I have never deviated. When I was elected I promised that I would do my utmost to secure increased representation to my constituents, and in that promise I have never wavered. The member for West Kimberley takes up the position that every member in this House represents every constituency, but that argument is untenable, and is not in accord with British ideas. It goes too far back to ancient customs, and simply means that we do not want any members at all, but that everything should be done according to the sweet will of the Executive. That will never answer in these days. Personally, I quite agree with the suggestion that the goldfields belong to the country, and that it is to the Government of the country we owe their development. I would not be one to suggest that the shipping should be taken by Esperance Bay, and the

trade given to other colonies, which should be done with Perth. I think that, in common justice, the people of the goldfields should give every possible return they can for all that has been done to advance their interests. As I said before, I do not believe the hon. member for Nannine is moved by any other motive in bringing this motion forward than to secure an expression of opinion from the Government, and the hon. members of this House, as to what is their intention for the future. The hon. member, I am sure, only wishes to see the Electoral Act carried out, without in any way interfering with the trade of the colony. He is anxious that in the future, and certainly before the next general elections, the four goldfields within the Yilgarn electorate should be declared separate electorates; and that one or two more should be declared in the Nannine district. I believe those are the intentions of the hon. member, and therefore I support him. I suppose the motion will meet with a numerical defeat, but I expect it will be a moral victory. I think the Government must see that a very large number of hon. members are in favor of the principle for which we are now contending. I will not go into figures, because hon. members know them as well as we do, but I will say that I think the hon. member for Nannine was below the mark in speaking of my district as having a population of 13,000. It is only just that this question should be considered, and the feeling in the country upon the matter set at rest. I hope the Government will see the request to be reasonable, and that they will say they will consider it at a convenient time, and that at no very distant date.

MR. JAMES: I think it impossible to treat the motion of the hon. member for Nannine in any other way than as one that asks for an expression of opinion from the House. The hon. member himself is far too cute not to see the difficulty of the position. He is asking us to give certain powers and privileges to persons that are not yet ascertained, so far as the goldfields are concerned. I do not think he should ask this House to pledge itself to give increased representation to the goldfields. We only give increased representation to voters, and, until we ascertain the number of voters, it is impossible to tell what increased representation should be given to the goldfields. Treating it as a motion asking for an expression of opinion, as to whether the gold-

fields should have more representation, I say at once I think they are entitled to it, and will be. I say they will be because I do not think the hon. member for Nannine wishes to change the Constitution Act at once. It is well to have an expression of opinion on this question, because it will set at rest a good deal of agitation. I am in favor of leaving the details to be set at rest when the rolls are made up. Treating the motion in that light, I give it my hearty support.

MR. RANDELL: I desire to address myself to this question somewhat carefully, and I may at once express my regret that the hon. member has put his motion in the form he has. I do not think he has supported his motion by the arguments he has used, for they apply more to increased representation for the goldfields than to a redistribution of seats. I take it that the districts have been mapped out in a very efficient way, and with very great advantage to the colony at large. I should not like to see a redistribution of seats, at any rate, not without very careful consideration of the question. I do not think we could follow the principle that is laid down, and acted upon, in more populous countries than on our own, viz., representation according to taxation. The circumstances of this colony are altogether different to those where that principle prevails. This colony is but sparsely populated, and we must recognise the vast variety of interests there are to be considered within the colony; and those vast interests must be represented. If we recognise that principle, it at once meets the argument for having representation according to the number of the population. It would be impossible to group the whole colony into groups where we could have an equal number of voters for every member, and if it were possible I do not think it would be desirable. I believe it is the general feeling of the country that the whole of the interests of the colony should be represented. It necessarily follows we must have some members elected by few voters when compared with others. Those are the general principles that have guided me in approaching this subject, apart altogether from the question as to whether it is desirable or not to alter the Constitution Act and have a general election. I feel sure nearly every member would deprecate that at the present time. The hon. member has intimated that, by the rate of progress we are now making, it will

require a reconsideration of this matter every year. I do not think we shall come to annual elections very soon. I consider we have struck a happy medium in fixing the elections for every fourth year. I consider that is sufficiently often. I should not care to have to go before a constituency every year seeking election. I do not think there is any desire on the part of any member of this House to do an injustice to the goldfields. Those fields and their interests have been in all our minds, necessarily so by the extension that has taken place. As to the future I believe there will be such further extension and development as few are aware of. We all hope, and many of us believe that in the course of a few years the colony will occupy an important position, almost entirely owing to the goldfields and the mining interests carried on within our borders. While I say this, I wish also to say I do not think the time has come when we should seriously consider the enlarging of this House by additional members. I do think that two additional members should, at the earliest reasonable opportunity, be given to the Coolgardie goldfields, and one more to the Murchison.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about Pilbarra?

MR. RANDELL: I think it is well represented already. That is, at any rate, how it has formed itself in my mind, as I have considered this matter. I think that course would fairly and equitably meet the opinions of the two parties upon this question. I think further that two additional members should be given to Perth. West Perth ought to be divided into two parts, not because it is most important, but because it is extending so rapidly, and one more member might be given to Fremantle, with some slight alteration with respect to boundaries. I think by such means we should be following out the principles we have adopted, namely, that the agricultural, the pastoral, the mercantile, and the mining interests shall all have fair representation. There is a very large population gathered on the goldfields, and I think they have some cause for complaint that they have only one representative in this House. There is a general feeling, I believe, that they ought to have more. Nothing, however, that I have heard, or read, has led me to believe there is any great feeling of dissatisfaction, either with the Ministry, or with this House, as to the way they have been dealt with. I think that within this House there is a desire to do

the fullest justice to the goldfields, because, as it has been well said, in caring for them we are caring for the interests of the colony. I do not think I need say any more, though I thought it well to express my opinion about the increase of members in this House. I am opposed to a redistribution of seats at the present time, but I am in favor of enlarging the representation of the more populous parts of the colony.

MR. MARMION: I think the hon. member who moved this resolution would probably have obtained a greater amount of support had he been more moderate in the tone of his resolution. There is no doubt about it, the hon. member's resolution excites the sympathy of the majority of hon. members, indeed, I think the whole of the members of this Assembly. There is about the resolution, however, a certain amount of hostility to the Government that has no doubt prevented it from obtaining such an expression of sympathy as would otherwise have been given. I think the general feeling of every hon. member who has considered the subject is, that the time must soon arrive when there must be a redistribution of seats, if I may use the common phrase for expressing this matter. I may say I consider that one reason might very well have been put forward by the Government, which has not been, probably because they did not deem it necessary; but one reason that strikes me as an argument why the goldfields should not, at the present time, seek to make the Government rush into the question of a redistribution of seats is this, that as the goldfields are situated now, there are large numbers of people there who cannot be termed settlers of Western Australia. They have come over here to see if it is good enough for them to remain in this country, and they have not yet decided to make this country their habitat. They have left their families elsewhere, and if they find this country good enough, they will make their homes, here and bring their families over and become settlers. Then will be time enough for us to extend to them the privileges which have been given to the older settlers in the colony. I do not think the would-be electors on the goldfields have any right to complain of any neglect of their interests by this House. They have been well looked after and well represented by the hon. members of this House who represent the goldfield constituencies. Although there

are only four of them, I am sure they have done the work of a dozen. They have done everything that could have been done for the interests of their various constituencies. I am sure I may say without any disrespect to any other members representing the goldfields that the hon. member for Yilgarn in his never ending zeal and eloquence has well looked after the interests of the goldfields. There have been other hon. members, too, who were ever ready to assist him in contending for the interests on which—as it has been well said—so many other things hinge in this colony. I am sure if the goldfields had no more representation than they have at the present time, they would still be well looked after. I feel sure that as soon as the Government are in a position to ascertain where the people intend to congregate, they will be ready to extend a fair amount of representation. My own view, judging from present appearances, is that the present Yilgarn constituency should be cut up into four electorates. There are now four fields, each one of which is sufficiently important, populous, wealthy in their auriferous production, and permanent to warrant their having one representative each in this House. The population of Coolgardie before very long will no doubt place it as the third town in the colony, and before very long again I believe it will take second place, and, possibly, before very long again it may take the first place, so far as population is concerned. I think Coolgardie can fairly lay claim to another representative, and the district around to yet another one. I feel sure that those whose interests are in that direction, and connected with mining, would be fairly well satisfied if they had four representatives for what is now known as the Yilgarn constituency. With regard to the Murchison, I think it is entitled to one, if not two more representatives. It must be borne in mind that the Murchison district must be eventually divided.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: There are four centres.

MR. MARMION: Yes, but I do not think they would be entitled to the same representation as the more prosperous and populous fields. I think that two or three representatives would be ample at present. I do not see any necessity for increasing the representation of the Pilbarra goldfield. They have now in the hon. member for East Kimberley a most capable representative.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS: He is a host in himself.

MR. MARMION: We have then the suggestion that for Yilgarn there should be four representatives instead of one, and three instead of one for the Murchison, the others to remain as they are at present. That would give nine representatives for what might be termed the gold-mining interests of the colony. I am perfectly sure that those hon. members who represent the goldfields will allow if these are given, there must also be given increased representation to the city of Perth and the town of Fremantle. The details would of course be considered when the question came up for actual consideration. I think Perth should have two more members, and I think Fremantle will run it closely for the same. I hope, however, to have the opportunity of speaking upon that question again when the proper time arrives. I think now we have arrived at this point, there is a general desire to further the interests of the constituencies and their representation; but I think that if the hon. member who hurriedly framed this resolution will give the subject clearer, calmer, more deliberate consideration, he will see there are so many hon. members in sympathy with him, but who cannot vote with him, that it will be wise for him to withdraw the resolution. I do urge upon him, with all due deference, to adopt that course. I think he is too old a Parliamentary hand to think that any discredit will attach to him if he does withdraw it. Hon. members are with him in principle, but not in the wording of his resolution. He will do credit to his own sagacity if, after replying to the Premier and others who have spoken, he withdraws his resolution, because, as I have said, there are so many of us who, whilst in sympathy with him, feel we cannot vote with him.

At 6.28 p.m. the Speaker left the chair.

At 7.30 p.m. the Speaker resumed the chair.

MR. A. FORREST: I should like to say a few words on this important motion, for it is hardly right that members should give a silent vote on a motion which means so much to the country. The hon. member for Nannine has placed his case before us—and a very hard case it has been for him, because a majority of members, I am sure, are against him at the present time—in asking that in this present session—[MR. ILLINGWORTH: I did not ask that]—the Government should deal with the question of the redistribution of seats, and that their decision not to do so at present is not satis-

factory to this House. All I can say is that the members on this side of the House, and many members on the other side, consider the decision of the Government on that point is satisfactory at the present time. The hon. member has attempted to make a great point—though I do not think it will carry much weight with members in this House—by contending that because there are a large number of adults on the eastern goldfields who are not on the electoral rolls, that is a reason why increased representation should be given immediately to those districts, although many of those men have not taken the ordinary precaution to have their names placed on the rolls. My opinion is that, until those men show that they care for the franchise by taking the ordinary steps to be registered as voters, the time has not arrived when we should listen to any arguments whatever for increasing the representation of the districts. The hon. member has dealt largely with the numbers of electors on the rolls in several districts, and I do not think he is far out in his estimate of the number on the goldfields. I should say, from my personal knowledge, there are fully the number of adults he has estimated in those localities. He thinks that because many of these men are not on the rolls as electors, they have a grievance on that account; but when they are put on the roll, as I hope they will be in due course, then will be the time for the hon. member to move in this direction, if he still thinks it worth while. But I do not think he will have the opportunity of moving at that time, because I am sure the Government are fully alive to the importance of giving to the goldfields population their fair share of representation, and it will not be left for a private member to introduce a question of this great importance—a question effecting the fate of the Government and of its supporters. I hope the Government will, when the proper time arrives, which should be when the next general election is approaching, bring in a Bill for giving three or four members to the Coolgardie goldfields, one or two more to the Murchison goldfields, and one or two to other districts. But the present time is not opportune for making this increase in the representation, I need hardly say that the members of this House who are in touch with the Government will, when the proper time arrives, take steps to have such a measure brought forward, and at the same time will be

desirous of giving increased representation to the centres of population in the eastern parts of the colony, so that the whole of the colony may have, as nearly as possible, a fair representation of the different interests which would be affected. When the hon. member for Nannine was speaking on the representation of the goldfields, I interjected a remark that the goldfields are represented by nearly all members of this House, besides the hon. members for Nannine and Yilgarn. Those of us who are immediately interested in the goldfields are fully alive to the importance of this question of representation; and I should be sorry for any member of this House to say he represents only the district that has elected him. I represent a northern squatting constituency, and I do all I can for it, and yet I am not prevented from advocating other interests, and I should be sorry to feel I was a member only for that portion of the colony which elected me to this House. I am sure we one and all desire to give the goldfields their fair share of representation, without fear or favor; but, if it is understood that this representation is to be on the basis of population, and without regard to the different interests that are at stake, I can not go so far as that, because, if such were the case, the district of Yilgarn, for instance, with the present population, would be entitled to as many members as there are in this House representing the whole colony, and I do not think hon. members would like to see such a change as that. The question of representation in the Southern portions of the colony is entirely different, for in those districts we have a settled population who are not likely to move. Some of their fathers were here before them, and I presume their children's children will be here also. But on goldfields the population is a floating one, although we hope, most of us, that these goldfields are of a permanent character; and, when the time arrives, which I hope will be at the next general election, for an increase in the political representation, I am sure the Government will not need to be asked by hon. members on the other side of the House to bring in a Bill for that purpose—as if the members on the other side had the interests of the whole country at heart, and we on this side had none. We recognise the importance of the question, and when the proper time comes for the Government to take action, if they do not then deal with the

question, they will not long remain in their places, because members on this side of the House, although not given to much speaking, have ordinary common sense, and are as fully alive to the interests of this colony as are members on the other side. I hope the hon. member for Nannine, after what has been stated, will withdraw this motion until a more convenient period. He can well understand that, if he presses it now, he will be in a very small minority. It would be better if, before bringing forward a motion of this kind implying censure on the Government, the hon. member would consult his party, or those who usually act with him, so as to ascertain the amount of support he might rely on, in entering on so great an undertaking as the redistribution of seats. If he had done so in this instance he would have found that, besides the member for Yilgarn, he might get one or two more from this side to vote with him, if they could be satisfied that the motion is opportune. I think that, at the present time, those hon. members who have as much interest in this question as any one else will agree that it is not advisable to bring on these very important motions, which involve the fate of the Ministry, and I am sure the hon. member for Nannine is not prepared at present to form a party in this House, because in the present juncture of affairs such a party would be rather peculiar. I hope the hon. member will take my advice on this one occasion, and withdraw his motion, because he may rest assured that the members on this side of the House, when the time arrives, will ask the Government to bring in a measure for increasing the representation.

MR. GEORGE: This is a motion on which, every every member of this House should state his opinion; and I do hope the hon. member for Nannine will not accept the very generous advice tendered to him by the member for West Kimberley. I shall vote for the motion, and I will tell you why. Not that I should take it as a motion of no-confidence in the Government, but simply because, as far as I am concerned, I recognise as a fact the motive which the hon. member evidently had when he put the notice of motion on the business paper. I do not think, for one moment, that he intended the motion as one of no-confidence, although he tells us now that he did. I do not take it that he intended it as a motion of no-confidence, because I think this debate will

show that the Government do intend to bring in a Bill dealing with this matter.

THE PREMIER: We have said nothing about it, and we don't want you to withdraw.

MR. GEORGE: Well, I do not think the mover intends to withdraw. Still, I think this debate will be very useful to the Government in showing—as it should if they are capable of being shown anything whatever—that comes from this side of the House—that it is possible on many subjects to have different opinions; and certainly the Government have given us a great amount of encouragement by what the Premier himself has told us. He has said with regard to the electoral rolls: "I want every man who is entitled to get on the roll." In saying that, I think the Premier is perfectly sincere and honest, and I do hope that, before there is any alteration in the Act, he will see that every man who is entitled to get his name on the rolls, and wishes to do so, shall have proper facilities for placing his name there. Before the last general election it was not so. I can name districts—and some hon. members will know them—where men entitled to be registered could not get on the rolls, because the facilities or the process were not placed before them; and I trust that the Premier will see that those disabilities are removed, and that those persons who want to be enrolled as electors shall not be prevented from registering through the difficulty or impossibility of not being able to find any person before whom the necessary declarations should be made. If this debate has done nothing else, it will have brought before the Premier the necessity of having proper arrangements made in the constituencies for the registration of voters before the next general election. I quite agree with the Premier when he says the southern voters are not all on the rolls. I know they are not, and I know particularly that some in the Murray district were not on the roll, as they ought to have been, at the recent election which returned me to this House. The Premier stated that this motion was brought in to annoy or oppose the Government. I think there was no intention of the sort. At any rate, there is no intention on my part, in supporting it, to annoy or oppose the Government. I intend to vote for the motion because, if not ripe now, the time will be ripe in another session. The hon. member for Fremantle (Mr. Marmion) told us that members are in favor of the principle,

but cannot accept the wording of the motion. I am in favor of the principle, and though I do not like the wording, I shall vote for the motion all the same, and not sacrifice the principle for mere verbiage. We are told also that gold has been the great attraction which has drawn population to our eastern districts; but, while recognising that, I am firmly of opinion that the people who have been attracted here by the goldfields are the class of men best fitted to open up a colony like this—men who are not afraid of hardships, but who leave their homes and families in other places and go into the interior of this colony as pioneers. And, if a change does come over the bright prospects of our goldfields, I think we shall get from the population of, say 20,000 gold diggers, a large proportion—perhaps one-half—who will remain here as permanent settlers and make homes in the country. There is one point on which I cannot agree with the hon. member for Nannine, in regard to the motion. I understood him to say his idea of the redistribution of seats is that numbers should be a great factor in it. [MR. ILLINGWORTH: No.] Well, I misunderstood him; but, if that were admitted as an argument, we might just as well bring in the money bag straight away at once, because if the mere presence of numbers of men in a constituency is to be the simple and sole warrant for having proportionate representation in Parliament, we may as well say that the man with a large balance at his banker's should have representation in proportion to the number of his sovereigns. Such a principle of proportionate representation would not be accepted by this Assembly, nor by the people in the country. I have gathered, from remarks made on the Government side, especially by the hon. member for West Kimberley, that it is the intention of the Government, before this Parliament is dissolved, to bring in a Bill. [MR. A. FORREST: I did not say so.] You are very diplomatic in your utterances, but I understood your remarks in that sense, and we know the relation you hold to the Government. I earnestly trust the other members of the Government who may speak in this debate will declare, in most unmistakable words, that the Government do intend before the next general election, to bring in some Bill that will do justice to those great constituencies where so many men are not directly represented at present, and

do justice also to the other parts of the colony.

MR. LEAKE: If members on this side were to accept the suggestion of the hon. member for West Kimberley, and wait till any resolution proposed on this (the Opposition) side of the House met with the approval of himself and friends, very few resolutions would emanate from this side. He twits the hon. member for Nannine with having brought forward this as an independent motion; but in that regard I think the hon. member for West Kimberley is mistaken, for I am certain the hon. member for Nannine did consult several members on this side before he brought the motion forward. It is my intention to support this motion. The Premier has given two replies, or expressed two opinions, upon this question of redistribution of seats. The one opinion was expressed in reply to a question put by the hon. member for Nannine, when the Premier said it was not the intention of the Government, at present, to introduce a Bill dealing with the question of redistribution of seats. The other reply he has given to the question is in his observations this evening, in the debate on this motion. And in neither of these instances do we find the hon. gentleman giving a definite, and what I term a satisfactory, answer upon this question. This motion seems to affirm that the decision of the Government is not satisfactory. No decision, or rather no reply, which is indecisive can be satisfactory upon so important a question as the redistribution of seats. Surely it is one of the most important, if not the most important, questions that this Parliament can have to deal with. It is a question which must inevitably crop up during the existence of every Parliament—that is assuming that this colony is to make progress in the same ratio that it has done during the last few months or years. It is the unexampled and unexpected increase in the number of persons who are qualified to vote which makes this question important, and one which it is necessary to consider. The necessity for the consideration of this question, I say again, must occur during times of great progress. To what extent has the population increased since the last amendment of the Constitution Act? It has increased, I suppose I am right in saying, by at least one-third; and does not that fact throw on the Ministry of the day the necessity of facing this question, and coming at any rate to some determination?



It is not satisfactory to the elected members of this House that the leader of the Government should come down and say that he does not intend to deal with this question at present. That, I take it, is tantamount to saying he will not deal with the question during this session of Parliament. Of course it may be urged that the Premier's phrase, "at present," has a wide application, and I think it has; but surely, on a question of this kind, we are entitled to know exactly where we stand, and to know whether we are to approach this question seriously or otherwise. Have not fresh and populous centres been created during the last few years? Has not the residence of people on the goldfields increased during the last few years beyond the expectation of many of us? Certainly it has increased far beyond the expectation of those hon. members who assisted in the passage of the Amending Constitution Act, which gave the fresh representation. And this question of representation I take it, does not apply merely to the goldfield centres, but it applies all over the colony; and it does not necessarily follow that, because we wish a redistribution of seats, we should in any degree curtail the representation of the northern electorates. Rather I think the desire is to increase the representation of the larger centres of population, and when I say that, I include, of course, places like Perth and Fremantle. It seems to me absurd to suppose that Yilgarn should have only one member, when the district includes places like Southern Cross, Coolgardie, Hannan's, Menzies, and the Dundas Goldfield. Surely, if representation means anything, those centres should have more than one representative. And why say that this question is inopportune, and that nothing justifies the ventilation of the question in this House or in the country? We have seen considerable expressions in the press, and from a quarter which, as a rule, I am sure carries great weight with the hon. gentleman opposite. We have seen strong references made by a certain section of the press, affirming the principle for which the hon. member for Nannine has contended. Representation, it is true, will not be based on wealth alone, on population alone, or on area alone; but I say that where you have the combination of wealth, population, and area, then you cannot disregard the claims of those centres. And is it not the fact that on the goldfields we have these three combinations—not in one centre.

but in the various centres which I have referred to—wealth, population, and area. These towns of Southern Cross, Coolgardie, Hannan's, Menzies, and Norseman, (Dundas) will all require to be represented; and why should we be satisfied with the statement made by the leader of the Government to the effect that the present time is inopportune, and that he will not deal with the question at present? One would have expected some definite statement or assurance from the Premier, and I am sure it would have been far more satisfactory if, instead of making an attack on the hon. member for Nannine, the Premier had favored this House with arguments which we might have considered as against the resolution. It is not satisfactory, I take it, for any hon. member to get up and attack the mover of a motion, if he will not deal with the substance of it, and here I might ask hon. members not to be frightened at the form which this motion has taken, but rather to consider its substance. The substance is the question whether or not there shall be a redistribution of seats. If an increase of at least one-third over and over the number of persons who were in the colony at the time the Constitution Act was amended, and our present system brought into force, is not a sufficient argument for considering this question seriously, I would like to know when we may consider such a time opportune. I do not quarrel with the proposition that there shall be no taxation without representation—it is a political truism by this time—but I go a step further than that, and say we should have no taxation without adequate representation. There is this to be said—and the idea seems to underlie and suggest arguments that have been advanced by those who sit opposite—that those who have the power do not like to part with it. The Government and their supporters are no doubt satisfied with the security of their position and of their power, so long as the present inadequate representation exists, and perhaps, if we look at it from a tactical point of view, we cannot blame them for clutching at a system which gives them a power that they wield in a manner which is apparent to every hon. member. Reforms are always difficult. They generally begin with a struggle from the very lowest point, and it is not until after great pressure and much argument and feeling have been exhibited that we

find those who have the power are forced to give way. I think I am right in saying there is a far greater representation in this Chamber of the farming and the squatting element than of any other; and when we consider that the farming and squatting element is not of that paramount importance that it was some time ago [Several HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!]. I say that it is not of the paramount importance it was some time ago, the gold mining industry having taken its place, I think we should give to the gold mining industry a greater share in the administration of affairs than it at present enjoys. And in dealing with this gold-mining question, I do hope the more conservative of hon. members in this House will not think they are giving what might be called a labor representation when they are dealing with the goldfields. Those who live on the goldfields represent more capital than anything else. They represent the wealth of the country. Why did we build our railways, why have we spent our money on the goldfields, if not to develop the latent wealth that is there? And we say it has been done with marked success. It was not a fair argument which was used by the Premier against this measure, when he said that those who live on the goldfields have no fixed interests. Why, one of the most important arguments in favor of building railways to goldfields was that there was vested interests to consider—that the mining industry and the wealth of the people invested in it required that we should build these railways. One of the very arguments that was used in favor of developing the goldfields is now almost turned against them, and is used against this question of the redistribution of seats. I do not propose to dwell at greater length on this question, but I do urge hon. members to affirm the principle which is contained in the motion, and it is to this effect, that the answer as to the decision of the Government on the question of the redistribution of seats is not satisfactory. Is it satisfactory? Are we not entitled to know whether the Government intend, sooner or later—either this session, next session, or before the next general election at any rate—to deal with this all important subject—a subject which is agitating the majority of the inhabitants of our colony—a question which has the support of what I may call the very temperate press of the colony; and yet we are to be told that the time is inopportune, and

that the Government will not deal with it at present. I do urge on members of the Government to bestir themselves upon this question; and it is extraordinary that it is necessary to frame pungent motions, before the Ministry can be stirred to a lively sense of what the country requires. I suppose the hon. member for Nannine does not expect that his motion will have the support of a majority of this House; but it affirms a good principle, and it is a popular principle—popular in this sense, that it is worthy of the consideration of a majority of the inhabitants of the country. And it is hardly a fair argument—it certainly is not a generous one—for the Premier to tell the hon. member for Nannine that it is merely an electioneering cry which he has got up to please himself, and perhaps some of his constituents. I do not myself support this as an electioneering cry, but I support it as an important question, for, so long as our population increases in the same ratio as it has done during the last few years, so long must this question continue to be one of almost burning importance. I go so far as to say that no Parliament will run its course for a considerable number of years together—I speak not of a session merely—without this question of the redistribution of seats arising once, if not twice, during its term. I urge hon. members again to consider this question as an important one, and not to be frightened at the form of the present motion, but to consider its substance; and, if they do that, they will, I hope, exact from the Government a more definite reply than has been vouchsafed to us by the Premier, either on the occasion of his replying to the question put by the hon. member for Nannine, or in the course of his observations on the motion before the House.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. A. R. Richardson): We have been counselled by the hon. member for Albany, and one or two other members, not to be afraid of the form of this resolution, but to consider the substance of it. That may be very good advice, in one way, with a view to obtaining a larger number of supporters than might otherwise be got for the motion; but when we study this motion and the form of it, have we any right to look at the question in the light suggested by the hon. member for Albany? It appears to me two issues are placed before us, in the motion. One is dissatisfaction with the Government, and the

other is the necessity of giving greater representation to the increasing population on the goldfields. Which, I ask hon. members to consider seriously, to consider fairly and squarely, is the more prominent issue of these two? Is it the question of dissatisfaction with the Government and want of confidence in them, or is it the simple desire to get more representation for the goldfields? If it had been the hon. member's honest and sole desire to get further representation for the goldfields, would he have taken this form of expressing it? Is he likely to get a larger following than if the motion were framed in more friendly terms, and the main issue confined to the question of more representation for the goldfields? I think the hon. member knows perfectly well it is not so. I know that was the form of argument used on the Education Question, and for which the hon. member and his friends claim some success. I will try now to rivet attention to the point as to whether the hon. member's intention is honest—whether it is his honest and sole desire to get more representation for the goldfields, or whether he has framed the motion in this form in order to get an expression of dissatisfaction with the Government introduced into the issue, by a side-wind. It must be apparent that if the hon. member's one desire was to get further and greater representation for the goldfields, he would not have taken this way of doing it; for he knows perfectly well, and so do hon. members generally know, that a large amount of sympathy and a greater number of votes would have followed him on this question of the redistribution of seats, if it had not been bracketed with an expression of dissatisfaction against the Government as the larger issue resulting from the motion. It is all very well to say that, because there has been a rapid and wonderful increase in the population of the goldfields, therefore the Government have been asleep; and are deaf and dumb to the voice of the goldfields for further representation. [MR. GEORGE: Who said that?] Until a few days ago, we had not heard of any agitation on those fields for more representation, because it is only recently, only as it were yesterday, that the population of these fields has sprung into prominence, and the representation needs time for its proper development. The hon. member for Nannine said the Government ought to lead public opinion; but who ever heard of a Government proposing their

measures for great changes, before public opinion had matured on the question? What chance would any Government have of passing such a measure as this, when they knew it was ahead of public opinion? Everyone knows that the history of public reforms in any constitutional country shows distinctly that when public opinion has developed and expressed itself loudly, the necessary legislation follows; and I say it always will be so, here and elsewhere. Public opinion must first settle down on a great question of this sort, because it would not be either a politic or proper move for the Government of the day to take in hand a question like this, and to initiate legislation upon it, far in advance of public opinion. No one knows that better than the hon. member for Nannine. [MR. LIVINGWORTH: I have not read history in that way.] Well, although on some subjects opinions may not materially differ, yet the expression of opinions does differ. A question that has been urged during the debate, in many different words, is as to whether the goldfields have suffered any injustice at the hands of this House, by the want of representation. That is really the main issue. If any one can show that the goldfields have suffered any injustice, or suffered politically in any way, from the want of adequate representation in this House, a good case will have been established. But what are the facts? It has been remarked that almost every member in this House represents the goldfields in some degree, and I think that is largely the truth. We have been told there ought to be no taxation without representation. Well, if there has been taxation on these goldfields, I would ask where the money so obtained has been expended. Has it not been returned to the goldfields in expenditure, to an extent almost greater than has come from them in taxation? If these goldfields which have risen so recently—and we cannot say even now that it is positively proved they will last for a long number of years, though we all hope they will, while nobody can positively say so—if these goldfields, I say, were to become unprofitable, if the bottom were to fall out, as the saying is, who would remain to bear the taxation which would be entailed as a consequence of the large amount of public money expended on them? Would these gold diggers have so much patriotic feeling as to remain in the country and help to bear the burden of taxation for all the railway expendi-

ture that has been, and is being incurred for developing those fields, and would they remain to patriotically furnish freight for the railway? No; they would soon turn their backs on us, when the goldfields had ceased to support them, and no one would blame them for looking after their own interests by going away. I think caution is sound policy in such a matter as this; and I say, fearlessly, that no one would be more ready than the Government to recognise the changing circumstances, and to recognise that our goldfields are established, and that the population has become a permanent one. The large amount of male population on the goldfields proves the contention that these people cannot yet be treated as a settled population; for where are the wives and children of these men? The very fact of there being such an enormous preponderance of adult males on the goldfields proves that they have left their belongings behind them and have not brought them to this colony. We shall be all ready and willing to welcome them as part and parcel of the population of Western Australia, and shall be ready to give these men, when settled here, the fullest representation they are entitled to; but until that is shown to be the case, as reasonable and prudent men we cannot say that, because a large number of men have rushed over here to seek their fortunes, we must recognise their right to have direct and immediate representation in Parliament. [An hon. Member: Why build railways to goldfields, then?] We build them largely on speculation, and the hon. member has himself, on previous occasions, opposed and complained of the Government on the score that we were building speculative railways—that there was too much of the speculative element in the Government proposals—that it was an impolitic movement to build them at all, and to spend such a large amount of money on the goldfields. But the hon. member is now like some other people, very wise after the event. We are bold enough to build these railways, and to build others on the same principle, because the speculation has turned out a good one. [MR. R. F. SKOLL: You ought to reduce the railway tariff.] Yes; and some members would argue that because we do not take the duty off everything the miners use, we want to crush them; but if we draw taxation from the goldfields, and spend the money in developing them, the account is squared. If we

give back that taxation in the shape of valuable public works, and make railways which reduce the cost of freight almost in the proportion of 1 to 4, I think we have done fairly well in enabling those people to get carried to the fields a ton of goods for £5 which used to cost £20 for carriage by road. Therefore they cannot complain of the use that has been made of the revenue received from taxation. The question of railway freights is not before us now, nor is the question of the redistribution of seats fairly before us. That which is before us is the question of dissatisfaction and of want of confidence in the Government; and I say it is a wrong and false issue to place before this House, and to try and shelter behind it an issue upon which members, even on that side of the House, hold different opinions. The crux of the question is centred in the point that the hon. member has not placed the proper issue before this House. If he were honest in his desire to get increased representation for the goldfields he would have placed a correct issue before the House, and endeavored to get a straight opinion upon it. I will not detain the House further, because I do not think there is very much in front of us except that particular point.

MR. CLARKSON: I must say I have been very much surprised to hear, from hon. members on the Opposition side, that this question is such a burning one—the question of the redistribution of seats. I was surprised also to hear that these men on the goldfields, some of whom have arrived in this colony only lately, and have very little stake in it, are very anxious to have votes. I do not believe they care so very much about the franchise. This is not the first time I have heard in this House that there was a great outcry for an extension of the franchise, and that the people were all impatient to get it. At the last general election, when the franchise had just been extended, I can speak for my own district, and I think also for most parts of the colony, in saying the people really took very little interest in it indeed. I know small farmers in Toodyay district, who have a considerable stake in the country, and have lived here all their lives, who did not take the trouble to go and register their names as electors; and I believe the same apathy exists in every part of the colony. I am surprised that the hon. member for Nannine should have been persuaded by his friends—who having admitted having persuaded him—to bring this motion forward,

because I am confident he does not believe in it. His constituents have not urged him in the manner he would have us believe. The hon. member for Yilgarn interjects that I should read the newspapers. I do read them, and I notice there has been some agitation in the district represented by the hon. member, but I believe it was got up, not by the hard-working, honest miner, but by the talking agitator—that is what I believe—by men who, for some reason, are anxious to pose as public benefactors by professing to get all these things done for the working man—for the working man who does not care anything about them. The hon. member for Nannine admits that he also has in view the question of no-confidence in the Government; but I will tell the hon. member that he is too soon—that the time has not yet arrived when the people of the colony wish to see another set of gentlemen in the seats on this side of the House; although I presume the hon. member hopes that he will live to see the day when he will sit here—a very laudable desire, no doubt. I think that time is far distant, and there will have to be a considerable redistribution of seats before that day comes about. We have heard a lot of talk about this motion, but I know perfectly well what the end will be. My hon. friends on the opposite side will show us their weakness—they will show us the nakedness of the land in which they live.

MR. SOLOMON: I am sure the mover of this motion must be satisfied with the expression of opinion given by almost every speaker—that is to say that in the near future they consider it will be necessary to provide for increased representation. When we consider the largely increased population, not alone in the centres of the colony but in almost every part, we must recognise that there are in every district a great number of persons who are not able to vote—that year after year the increase of population is so great that there must be, under the present franchise, numbers of men who are not on the rolls, even after having been here for a time approaching to two years' residence in an electoral district. For that reason there are many persons all over the colony who are not registered as voters, and there must be a good average in every district who are disfranchised in consequence. When we consider that there are only some 800 voters on the rolls in the Yilgarn district, as compared with about 13,000 adult males in that district,

there must be serious difficulties in the way of registration, or there is a very large proportion of men who have not been long enough resident in the district to entitle them to registration as voters. Therefore we can only assume that to a very large extent, especially in the goldfields' districts, the population is a moving one, and not a permanent one. Still, the time is approaching when, no doubt, settlement to a large extent on those fields is bound to take place. We know also that wherever there are rushes to new finds of any great value the district around becomes comparatively deserted, and even a place like Coolgardie itself might be left with very few inhabitants, after great rushes to new finds of gold. Consequently, until there is a proper system of franchise, and of registration, it is probable that a great number of persons who have been in the colony over the time specified in the Act have not, on that account, taken advantage of the opportunity to register. It is not my intention to say much on this motion, because I have an amendment to propose, and I am sure the hon. member for Nannine will fall in with its terms. It is an expression of opinion with regard to the future, and not with regard to the present. Although I am almost certain that, before at any rate the next two years have elapsed, it will be necessary to have a redistribution of seats, yet I think the hon. member for Nannine will say that it is not advisable to make the change until the colony is more settled. I beg to move, as an amendment, to strike out all the words after the word "that," and insert the following words in lieu thereof—"This House is of opinion, that, for the representation of the goldfields in large centres of population, it is necessary that provision be made for their increased representation, before the next general election"

The amendment was not seconded.

MR. LEFROY: I think the question of the redistribution of seats must be, in every country, taken as one that requires to be approached very carefully. I think we should be very careful that these goldfields should not be over-rated, if only in the interests of the colony itself. The hon. member for Albany has told us that the farming and the squattling industries of the colony, are not of that paramount importance that the goldfields are. I trust the hon. member will not be of that opinion if he ever takes his position at the helm of the ship of State, for if the Government do

not recognise the importance of, and assist agricultural and kindred industries, I am afraid the colony will not progress as it should. When hon. members representing the goldfields can prove that an ounce of gold placed in the ground, will produce another ounce, I shall consider the goldfields to be of equal importance to the industries I have mentioned. The farming and pastoral interests are the backbone of a country like Australia, because they are able to increase by natural development, which goldfields cannot do. I mention this hoping that hon. members will take a broad view of the question, and not try and overrate the goldfields. We have been told that these miners go out into the country and toil hard with their lives in their hands. Did not the men who first opened up and settled the country to the same; and did they not suffer as great hardships as miners have to put up with now? These are the men who have helped to bring the colony to its present position, and who helped to keep it going until gold was discovered. I do hope hon. members for the goldfields will not always parade the difficulties and troubles of the gold miners. Parliament was done everything that is possible to assist them, more in fact than was done for the pioneer settlers. I do not think the present time opportune to deal with this question of re-distribution of seats, simply for the reason that it should be dealt with carefully and cautiously, and I hardly think we can deal with it during this Parliament. I feel, however, that the Government must recognise that the time is coming when further representation of the goldfields will be necessary, and that the Government will, when the time arrives, be prepared to deal with the matter.

MR. HASSELL: In voting as I shall vote to-night I wish it to be understood that I shall not vote against a redistribution of seats, but against the motion which is expressive of a want of confidence in the Government.

MR. MOSS: I cannot allow the debate to terminate without explaining the reason why I intend to vote against the resolution. Although I am strongly of opinion that the Government must consider the necessity of giving increased representation to the goldfields and other populous centres, still I am not prepared to vote for the resolution. The Government have promised to bring down some scheme of electoral reform, and I am satisfied to wait for

that before going into the more important question of a redistribution of seats. I do not think the Government have hitherto acted in any niggardly spirit towards the goldfields, as large sums of money have been spent in building railways, conserving water, establishing Warden's Courts at every centre, and in affording many other facilities. I therefore agree that the question should not be forced upon the Government at present, although I am thoroughly in accord with the principle underlying the motion.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt): I am fully aware that the general opinion must be that this unreal debate should come to an end, and I trust the House will pardon me if I offer a few remarks before the question is put to a division. I wish to point out exactly what this resolution is, so that there may be no mistake about it, for I fear that there is a tendency on the part of some hon. members who have spoken to run, as it were, behind the resolution, and to think that they are supporting something else when they vote for it. The resolution emanates from the hon. member for Nannine, and we have the assurance of the leader of the Opposition that it has the sanction of his party, be it more or less. It also has the sanction of the triumvirate composed of the hon. member for Albany, the hon. member for Nannine, and the hon. member for Geraldton. They seem to be following out the principle, and are redistributing their seats every hour. We can never be sure where to catch them. Possibly I ought to congratulate the Opposition on the rearrangement of its family. It has not led to an increase, but has rather eliminated some of the children, who would not, I fear, recognise their parents. I think that is so. Now, what is this resolution which we are asked to discuss? It is this: "That the decision of the Government in reference to the question of 'Redistribution of Seats,' is not satisfactory to this House; and it is not in harmony with the expressed desire of the mining districts, nor is it in accord with the opinion of the majority of the people of this colony." That is what we are asked to vote upon. Now what is this decision of the Government? It is admitted to refer only to the answer given by the Premier that the Government did not intend to deal with the question at present. I challenge the right of the Opposition to tell us when we shall deal with it. They have the right to say that the decision is unsatisfactory, but

they have no right to ask the Government when they intend to deal with it. That is what the Government have to consider, and to communicate to the House in due time. If the House is satisfied that this is not the time to take action, the matter is concluded, and those who are of that opinion should vote against the resolution. The motion is admitted to be one of want of confidence in the Ministry. The hon. member for Albany tells us that it was moved after the Opposition had considered it, but he finds now that some of the party are running away from him, and is forced to tell them not to be frightened by the language, but to look at the substance of the resolution. What is the substance, if it is not a want of confidence motion? In this matter there is no room for compromise at all. It is a point upon which we ought to take a division and see how we stand. I have never heard of an attempt to tone down a distinct vote of want of confidence by an amendment such as that which it was attempted to move just now. The Government, however, stand or fall to-night on the question that the present time is not opportune for a redistribution of seats. Whether it will be considered opportune next year, or the year after, will remain to be seen. This country is not always going to remain as it is, and as it grows the attention of the Government must be drawn, sooner or later, to this great question of the redistribution of seats, especially in those parts of the colony where the population is a moving one. But the question now is whether the reply of the Premier to the hon. member for Nannine is satisfactory. Now I deny that population is the basis of representation, as I understood the hon. member for Nannine to put it.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I did not say so, and I do not believe it.

THE ATTORNEY - GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt): Then I misunderstood the hon. member. The hon. member for Perth very well stated the position when he said that we have very peculiar circumstances to deal with in this vast colony. When you find a diversity of interests spring up in a closely settled population, then you want to represent different interests; but when the community is spread over a large area the same amount of representation is not needed. Whatever would be the representation of a city like London on the basis of population? It would be enormous. Then again, I would like to

know what has induced the hon. member to bring forward this resolution. What has ruffled the calm waters? The hon. member is only being pushed from behind by a small party on the goldfields. Both he and the hon. member for Yilgarn admit that the Government have done a great deal for the goldfields. We have been going hand in hand with the population, holding the money bag. Just think of the money spent on water conservation, Warden's courts, post offices, and the many other facilities afforded, and the reduction of the Tariff on the foodstuffs consumed by the mining population. It is true we did not include tinned meat in this reduction, because the Government thought the miners should pay duty on some article. We have also introduced a new Goldfields Act which removes some of the existing difficulties, while there is also a Bill in the other House to protect the underground miner.

MR JAMES: It is a good measure, I believe.

THE ATTORNEY - GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt): I hope hon. members will help the Government to carry that Bill through. No doubt we will meet with opposition in some quarters. Are these not proofs that the Government have not forgotten their duty to the miners? Then there is the Mint, which will work entirely in the interests of the mining industry, and I am glad to say the Government have carried the Bill through both Houses already. Then, in addition to all this, have not the Government assisted in the development of the goldfields by the construction of railways? When the hon. member for Albany, for instance, held back and said we were going too fast? I say the hon. member who leads the Opposition held back. This is what he said on the proposal to construct the Cue and Coolgardie railways:—"It is possible for us all to go too fast. Can anyone stand up in this House and say that either the Murchison or the Yilgarn and Coolgardie goldfields, having regard to the amount of public money spent on their development, have not had the fullest possible consideration from the Government and from Parliament. Is it not sufficient to have built fifty or sixty miles of railway towards the Murchison goldfields, over an almost impassable sand plain; and is it not sufficient for the Government to have bridged over 170 miles, in fact, more than half the way to the Coolgardie goldfields? And yet we are asked to pledge ourselves to a further loan, before

"we are in a position to appreciate the "practical result of that recent expenditure." The Government said it was not sufficient to only run those lines half way, but have asked Parliament to consent to them being extended, and the work is now progressing. Further, the hon. member said:—"I shall certainly, when the time approaches, ask the Government to give some assurance, either by producing the reports of independent experts, or of their own competent officers, to show what guarantee they have of the permanency of these goldfields. As I have said, there are only two mines paying dividends at present; and if we don't take care we may find this Coolgardie railway will be a railway to Bayley's Find and the Hampton Plains Syndicate country." We get no encouragement to carry out all these works, for at the very time when we have our coats off, as it were, and are busily engaged in the work, the hon. member comes in with a motion seeking to turn us out of office. We cannot do all the work in a moment, and this question of a redistribution of seats has not escaped attention, and will be dealt with all in good time. I ask hon. members to wait until a proposition is before the House with regard to a redistribution of seats, and to let the Government take their own time about it. I do not know whether it would be advisable to give a large amount of representation to what may be termed a pick and shovel population, that is, a community composed of men who seldom remain in one fixed place. We cannot give men like that representation, because if we do, it will be found that the voters, and Electoral Registrar, and the whole bag and baggage will be gone elsewhere in a few months time. When these particular portions of the country are properly developed, the claim for extended representation will be listened to; but I think the House can rest assured that the question will be justly dealt with within a certain limit of time. It is probable that, before the next general elections, the House will be asked to consider the question in some way or another. A good deal has been said about the Electoral Act, while the hon. member for Nannine has stated that people cannot get on to the roll. That is all nonsense. There is no trouble in that if they are eligible, for all they have to do is to apply to be put on. When it is found that certain sections of the community will not take the trouble to secure their right to exercise the franchise, it is not

fair to say that they cannot get on the roll. Miners will not leave their work for the purpose of obtaining the privilege to vote for the hon. member for Nannine. They might make application for inclusion on the roll, if they have little else to do; but as a rule mining communities are not given to making claims for voting powers. If they suffered under any grievance and did not get justice at the hands of the Government, then they would have something to complain about, but they have not a single grievance. The miners say themselves that no Government in the Colonies ever did for the community what this Government has done, and I repeat that they have no grievance. They have not asked for this redistribution of seats. It is a mere electioneering dodge on the part of the hon. member for Nannine and I ask the House to give, as far as possible, a unanimous vote against the resolution proposed by that hon. member.

MR. CONNOR: I cannot allow this debate to close without stating that, in spite of the brilliant arguments used by hon. members, particularly the last speaker, the fact remains that the goldfields have not sufficient representation. However, I cannot support the motion worded as it is; but I must say that the sooner legislation is provided in the direction indicated, the better it will be for the country generally. I cannot altogether agree with the principle that there should be no taxation without representation, because I am opposed to all the aliens in the country having voting powers, although they have to pay some taxation. The principle aimed at by the motion is a good one; but, as the resolution follows upon some half a dozen others expressing a want of confidence in the Government, I cannot support it. With regard to the statement of the Attorney-General that the miners are satisfied in having railway and other facilities afforded them, I must say that they are desirous of being able to take a part in the politics of the country as well, and there are no more eligible persons for that privilege than they.

MR. SIMPSON: I understood from the remarks made by the Premier on the occasion when the hon. member for Albany gave notice of a motion of want of confidence in the Government on the Education Question, that unless the motion were moved by the leader of the Opposition the Government would not accept it as being hostile to them. To-night



they have adopted a different procedure. They have changed their attitude, and I think the House is fortunate, in that hon. members will have an opportunity of hearing those satisfactory utterances of the Attorney-General in regard to the attitude of the Government on this question. On looking at the answer of the Premier to the question of hon. member for Nannine, I say it is not satisfactory, as the resolution states; but coupled with the assurance that the Government do purpose dealing with the question at the earliest possible moment.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Oh, no.

MR. SIMPSON: I think the hon. the Attorney-General said the Government were full of work at present, and that they would attend to this matter as soon as possible.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): The Government did not say so. You want to climb down.

MR. SIMPSON: I do not want to climb down; but I am always very careful on these matters. So far as I gather from the debate, I do not think there is any great difference of opinion on the main principle of a re-distribution of seats. I think the House recognises that additional representation of the goldfields is necessary. For my own part I would sooner see increased representation follow immediately after the amendment of the Electoral Act, as it is the natural corollary of that legislation. With regard to what fell from the hon. member for Moore, the new recruit of the Government, I entirely agree with him, and I hope I shall never commit the error, and I hope the feeling will never rule in this House, of endeavoring to set one industry against another. Our resources are mutually dependent upon each other's development. I have never heard disparaging remarks made about the pioneer settlers of colony, but I am not aware that they suffered more hardships than the pioneers of any other colony. I hope these industries will all work together, and I suppose it is a happy incident for the farming and pastoral communities that markets are being established in the centres; and I hope also that the day will come when the Government will convey produce to the market at the bare cost without making any profit. The Attorney-General was indiscreet in saying he was not prepared to give pick and shovel men a vote.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt): I did not say so.

MR. MARMION: He said representation.

MR. SIMPSON: The agriculturist works with a pick and shovel, and therefore the argument is not a good one in connection with this great question. The Attorney-General has told us that the Government recognise the necessity for a re-distribution of seats. He has also told us that they were busy with their coats off, and that as soon as they are able to control the arrears of work, they will immediately consider the question.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt): I ask to be allowed to explain Sir, that I said we were busy with our coats off, as it were, on behalf of the mining population.

MR. SIMPSON: I still gather that it is the intention of the Government to adopt this piece of legislation. I congratulate them upon it, and when it comes to a re-distribution of seats and an equitable allotment of representation in this House, I am sure the Government will have the assistance of the Opposition in helping to make a law that will give equal representation of the wealth and resources of the country, and of its varied interests.

MR. ILLINGWORTH, in reply, said:—I desire to thank hon. members on both sides of the House for the very kindly expressions of opinion that have been given on the principle for which I am contending. I make no apology for my mode of attack. So long as I abide by the legal forms of the House, I shall not ask hon. members what devolves upon me as a representative of a constituency, and I have yet to learn whether any hon. member has been appointed to educate other hon. members as to the duties they are to perform. Now I shall make no reference to the personal remarks of the Hon. the Premier, except to suggest that in a little excitement he said things he did not intend to say. The position, I take it, is that so far as experience teaches, the Government, who control the affairs of this country, will not give that attention to important questions which are before the country, that they need, until some motion is proposed that arrests their attention. It was very convenient indeed for the Ministry to take up the position they have on this motion. If they were prepared to accept it and treat it as a vote of want of confidence, they should have followed the usual Parliamentary practice by immediately adjourning the House

when notice of the motion was given. That such was the practice, was admitted by the hon. the Premier when, on a previous occasion, a similar motion to this was discussed.

**THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest):** Notice in that case was given for a week hence and not for a day.

**MR. ILLINGWORTH:** I did not make the mistake that was then made, but gave notice for discussion the following day. The Opposition did not happen to have a leader at the time, so every man had a right to do that which was right in his own opinion. I want to make one remark in reference to motives. I have not the slightest doubt but that the hon. gentlemen who occupy the Ministerial benches are about the ablest people I have heard of at reading the inner minds of hon. members. The hon. the Premier said he knew I had proposed the motion for the express purpose of pleasing some of my constituents. I do not know whether it will please them or not. When the day comes that I have to speak or vote, because it is necessary to please my constituents, I shall resign and go out of the House. I understand too much about what is necessary for the independence of politics, to lend myself to such a low action as that. Hon. members are here to do their duty, and the man who is afraid to express his opinion, and is unwilling to give his vote on any question, because of the effect it would have in his constituency, is not worthy of a seat in this House. Now, I had a distinct reason for proposing this motion in this form, and I am happy to say I have achieved my object.

**THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest):** What is it?

**MR. ILLINGWORTH:** I am not going to disclose my diplomacy, and I shall always act, conscientiously believing that what I am doing is right.

**THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest):** Why not tell us about it.

**MR. ILLINGWORTH:** It is not desirable to do so. The Government will not tell the House when they will proceed with this question. I know they will when they are forced to do so by the House. I do not want the question to be dealt with this session, and it was because of that, that I put the motion in its present form. There is one statement I do want to make before this debate closes, and it is one I desire the Premier to make a note of. The mining community of this colony have

never made one single word of complaint against the Government, or one single allegation of either lack of integrity, of duty, or of not doing anything requisite for the proper development of the goldfields of the colony. The mining districts have not complained of the manner in which the Government has carried on this work of development. We fully recognise the manner in which the work has been done, and every district is grateful for the work the Government is doing, but is it a reason, because a railway is to be built to Cue or Coolgardie, because we are grateful, because the Government have done their work thoroughly, that the people for whom this is being done should go without votes? Personally I give the Government great credit, and I have to say that whenever I have had occasion to wait upon any Minister with any request, I have been met with the utmost readiness and a desire to carry out anything that was at all in reason, but is that a reason why the people in my electorate should not obtain their votes, or have adequate representation in this House? It is this kind of thing that disturbs my equanimity and makes me say things I do not want to say. Because we have got a railway, or are going to have one, you say we ought not to have a vote. Because we have got what ought to have been given to us, and what we had a right to get, and for which we are grateful, is that any reason why we should be deprived of any voice in the spending of the large sums of money to which we contribute, and which are under the control of the Government. There are 20,000 men on the goldfields, with three representatives, while another district has nine representatives for two, three, or four thousand. Is there anything unreasonable that we should ask the power to take our place as citizens of this country, and we should have proper representation and control the expenditure of the money which is provided by ourselves? Is there any reason why, because the people on the goldfields have been given one thing, that they should not ask for more? Every day we have some district or other seeking for more than they had before. Everyone is seeking for new steps in the development of other portions of the colony not connected with the goldfields, and no one complains when they are successful. However, as soon the mining industry asks for something there is immediate complaint from those who represent other indus-

tries. I desire to say, Sir, that the hon. member for Moore was very unfair in his remarks. I do not say he was intentionally unfair, for that I know he would not be, but he was, nevertheless, unfair in his remarks when he declared that the representatives of mining constituencies were disposed to oppose anything being done for the advancement of that particular industry with which he was identified. The members for mining constituencies have given their support to the development of not only that particular industry but of every other industry as well. The Attorney-General has given us a picture of the Ministry with, metaphorically speaking, their sleeves turned up, hard at work, turning out Bills for this House of such an important character and to such an extent that they have not had time to deal with this question. Now, Sir, I wonder whether the Bill we had before this House last night is one of those important measures.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt): Yes, its object is to further the agricultural interests.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Then it is with that kind of a Bill that the Government has been so fearfully busy? Is it not true that this House has been repeatedly adjourned because there was not sufficient work for it to do.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt): I desire to explain what I did say. I used the term working in our sleeves when I enumerated a list of things we had done for the mining industry, and things we were doing when this resolution was brought down upon us. I did not say we were busy at this precise moment, but, so far as I am concerned, I have been busy all the year round.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I do not desire to do an injustice to the Attorney-General or anyone else. To-night we have the answer of the Government, on what I was the first to urge upon the attention of the Government, the inconsistencies of representation. During the address in reply I put before the House certain figures. I gave the Government sufficient time to make enquiries so that they could be in a position to answer my question. I asked that question and the Government said they did not propose to deal with the question "at present." Some members seem to think that "at present" meant that the Government did propose to deal with the question at some future date. I understood it to mean that they would deal

with the question when they were compelled to.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Why do you think it means that.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I have surely a right to read the answer in my own way. I am now pleased with the promises that have been given us on this question by the hon. the Premier, as well as the hon. the Attorney-General. The position in which the question stands in to-night, after this debate, is an entirely different one to that in which it stood before. The position now is that we have a declaration from all sides of the House that the principle I have behind this resolution is to be brought into effect some time. In saying this I have to admit that the form of the resolution is really one of want of confidence, but when the Government refused to recognise two distinct votes of want of confidence, I had no right to suppose that mine would be accepted in any way different from those. I fail to see why, when the Premier refused to accept a motion of want of confidence as such, the other evening, he should consider mine in any different light.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): You said that you meant it as a no-confidence motion.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Yes, so I did on the Education Question. We got what we wanted then, and I have got what I wanted now. I am perfectly satisfied with the debate as far as it has gone, and I thank hon. members of this House for the expressions of opinion they have given. I am satisfied that the debate will be satisfactory to the people who are residents in the goldfields' districts, and who will be glad to find that so many members of this House will at some time or other be prepared to give them fair representation. I want to remove any false impression there may be on one point. I have never pleaded that the basis of representation should be population, but I do think that a large industry such as that of mining should be more adequately represented. If I had pleaded for representation on the basis of population I would have been asking for an assembly of over 130 members. The figures I have quoted will show this. I do not ask for this. I ask for nothing more than fair and equitable representation, not only for the goldfields, but for other parts of the country where there is any striking change in the mass of population. I think it is a wrong and an

injustice that numbers of the people should be unable to go on the roll of electors, and unable to express an opinion as to the disposal of the revenue of the colony, to which they are large contributors. I hope this will be largely altered in the remedial measure which is to be introduced. I shall be ready to deal with this question when it comes up the proper way. As to any members supposing that I hoped to carry a want of confidence motion, let me say that I never thought of such a thing. I could not conceive such a possibility even in my wildest dreams. I could not believe that the Forrest Ministry could be shifted even with dynamite. An honorable gentleman said to me to-day that the ministry is "a ministry of any price." I do not say it, but he said it, and he is a man of influence. He is a West Australian as well, and not one of your horrid "tother siders." I do ask the House that when this question of the redistribution of seats does come up, they will give the subject every consideration such an important matter demands. I would again thank hon. members on both sides of the House for the manner in which my resolution was received.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: This debate has been very much prolonged, but I should not like it to close without saying a word or two with regard to the hon. member who has just sat down, and who has occupied the floor of this House for a considerable time to-night. If the hon. member for Nannine has the courage of his opinions he will call for a division. I think he has only brought this question forward for effect. If he is honest in the position he has taken up he will call for a division, and if he does not, I will, even if I have to vote with him. There is too much of this sort of work going on. Hon. members bring motions before the House, and after declaring that they are able to see from the indications given that members are in sympathy with the principles advocated, they gradually slide out, and declare they have gained their point without the feeling of the House on the subject being tested at all. As I said before I am opposed to him in this, but if he does not call for a division I will.

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

Ayes ... ..	6
Noes ... ..	22
Majority against ... ..	16

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. George	Mr. Burt
Mr. James	Mr. Cookworthy
Mr. Leake	Mr. A. Forrest
Mr. Moran	Sir John Forrest
Mr. Simpson	Mr. Harper
Mr. Illingworth (Teller).	Mr. Hassell
	Mr. Lefroy
	Mr. Loton
	Mr. Marmion
	Mr. Moss
	Mr. Phillips
	Mr. Piesse
	Mr. Randell
	Mr. Richardson
	Mr. H. W. Sholl
	Mr. R. F. Sholl
	Mr. Solomon
	Mr. Throssell
	Mr. Traylen
	Mr. Veun
	Mr. Wood
	Mr. Clarkson (Teller).

Motion negatived.

#### JUSTICES APPOINTMENT BILL.

A message was received from the Legislative Council reporting having agreed to the *Justices Appointment Bill* with certain amendments, the concurrence of the House in which was desired. The Attorney-General moved that the consideration of the message be made an order of the day for the next sitting of the House. Motion agreed to.

#### MINES REGULATION BILL.

A message was received from the Legislative Council informing the House of its having appointed a Committee of five members to enquire into the *Mines Regulation Bill*, with power to call for persons and papers, and to report on 28th August, and requesting that the Legislative Assembly would elect a similar number of members of their House to act as a joint Committee with the representatives of the Legislative Council.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL moved that the consideration of the message be made an order of the day for the next sitting of the House.

Motion agreed to.

#### FERTILISERS AND FEEDING STUFFS BILL.

##### IN COMMITTEE.

Consideration in Committee resumed on the proposal of the Commissioner of Crown Lands (Hon. A. R. Richardson) to amend sub-section of Clause 11, "interpretation," by substituting the words "citric acid" in lieu of water. The Commissioner of Crown Lands stated that he had made further enquiry into this matter.

He has previously been afraid that testing of manure by water alone would act unfairly towards the manufacturer and importer, but he has since ascertained that this would not be the case. No alteration would, therefore, be necessary.

The clause, as printed, was agreed to.

Clause 15, "commencement." Question of commencement of the Act be 1st January, 1896.

Put and passed.

Bill reported.

#### RAILWAY AND THEATRE REFRESHMENT ROOMS LICENSING BILL.

##### SECOND READING.

Debate on the motion for second reading resumed.

MR. RANDELL: Sir, when I moved the adjournment of the debate I had, as my reason, a doubt as to whether Clause 6 would be sufficient, but I have since found that it is to be read in conjunction with the Wines, Beer, and Spirits Sale Act, and the act provides for the notice spoken of in the Clause. I now see no reason for saying anything further on the second reading. I may have something to say when the Bill is in committee, but it will only be on matters of detail. I may say that I have conferred with the hon. the Attorney-General, who has showed me that the notice to be given according to section 6, and the schedule of the Bill are in accordance with section 16 of the Wine, Beer and Spirits Sales Act.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I do not intend to take up the time of the House in discussing the second reading of this Bill, but I think it is my duty to intimate to the Attorney-General that when Clause 7 is before the Committee, I shall desire an alteration to be made. I think the provision which grants the right for liquors to be sold during mere rehearsals is a grave mistake, and one that will, if agreed to, create a great deal of trouble. I trust the Hon. the Attorney-General will see that it is hardly necessary to provide liquor at such a time. There are plenty of hotels in the locality, without having a law which will be open to grave abuse. As the clause reads at present, it would be only necessary to get up a rehearsal in order that drink could be supplied all night.

MR. PIESSE: I think there is a good deal in what the hon. member for Nannine has said

with reference to this question. If we give this power during rehearsals, we might as well make the license a permanent one. I would also like to be informed on another point. We have in this colony several refreshment rooms on private lines of railway, and I would like to know how they will be affected. The term "commissioner" evidently means the Commissioner of the Government Railways, and the question is whether he is to control the refreshment rooms on private lines and over which he has no control. It appears to me that some special provision is necessary to deal with private lines.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt): The last point mentioned by the hon. member for the Williams is one to which I will give my attention.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### ARBITRATION BILL.

##### IN COMMITTEE.

The Bill, as amended by the Select Committee, was considered in committee, and agreed to without further amendment.

Bill reported, with the Select Committee's amendments.

Report adopted.

#### PARTNERSHIP BILL.

##### IN COMMITTEE.

The Bill, as amended by the Select Committee, was considered.

Clauses 1 to 9 inclusive:

Put and passed:

Clause 10.—What is a firm:

MR. WOOD thought that persons trading as firms should be registered in this colony. Such a provision would do a great deal of good, and was well worth consideration. At the present time everything went all right until there was trouble, and then the man of substance got out, and the creditors were left to look after the man who had nothing.

MR. JAMES pointed out that the suggestion would be one to be dealt with in a separate Bill. The registration of firms could not be provided for in a single section. There would have to be about 40 clauses in such a Bill.

The clause, as printed, was agreed to, and the remainder of the Bill, as amended by the Select Committee, was agreed to without amendment.

Bill reported, and report adopted, on the motion of Mr. James.

# CRIMINAL EVIDENCE BILL.

## IN COMMITTEE.

The Bill, as amended by the Select Committee, was considered.

Clause 1:

Agreed to.

Clause 2—In certain cases the accused, etc., to be both competent and compellable witness.

MR. SOLOMON would like to see the word "compellable" taken out of the clause as affecting a wife. It was a serious matter to compel a wife to give evidence against her husband, and might injuriously affect many women of delicate constitutions.

MR. JAMES pointed out that the object of the Bill was as much to the interest of accused persons as otherwise. If a man was innocent it would be to his advantage to be able to call his wife, and if he was guilty the evidence of the wife might be material, and this was what the Crown wanted to be able to get. In some cases a man himself could be called, and there was, therefore, no reason why his wife should not be called as well.

Clause agreed to.

The remainder of the Bill was agreed to without further amendments.

Bill reported with the Select Committee's amendments.

Report adopted.

## ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 10.20 o'clock p.m.

# Legislative Council,

Thursday, 8th August, 1895.

*Fremantle jetty; appliances at—Joint Committee; Extension of powers of—University College; Establishment of—Legislative Council; accommodation at—Partnership Bill: first reading—Arbitration Bill: first reading—Criminal Law Evidence Bill: first reading—Federal Council; Meeting of—Licensed Surveyors Bill: third reading—Married Women's Property Bill; third reading—Loan Act, 1891, Re-appropriation Bill; third reading—Municipal Bill: in committee—Mines Regulation Bill; message from Legislative Assembly—Adjournment.*

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir J. Shenton) took the chair at 4.30 o'clock, p.m.

## FREMANTLE JETTY—APPLIANCES AT.

THE HON. A. B. KIDSON asked the Minister of Mines, whether it is the intention of the Government, in order to cope with the landing of the large quantity of heavy mining machinery now arriving and about to arrive at the port, to, as soon as possible, provide, at the Fremantle jetty, a steam crane capable of lifting a dead weight of 12 tons at least.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom) replied: The crane in use is capable of lifting 10 tons. In the event of any heavier weight having to be raised one of the other Government cranes could be utilised which can lift 30 tons.

## JOINT COMMITTEE—EXTENSION OF POWERS OF.

THE HON. F. M. STONE, without notice, moved that the Joint Committee on the Mines Regulation Bill have power to sit during any adjournment of the House.

Question put and passed.

## UNIVERSITY COLLEGE—ESTABLISHMENT OF.

THE HON. H. MCKERNAN asked the Minister of Mines, whether the Government intended to place a sum of money on the Estimates this session with the view of starting a University College for Western Australia.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom) replied: It is not the intention of the Government to make provision for a University College just now, but a small sum will