

for the conference which had taken place, and but for this extraordinary move by the leader of the Labour party in allowing himself to be made a tool of. One saw Ministers coming and going in and out of the House, for they discovered that they did not have sufficient supporters in the Chamber.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: The hon. member should confine himself to the truth.

MR. MORAN: To confine himself to the truth, he would not always live in the same place as the hon. member. The debate should be adjourned for a fortnight, though he would not move in that direction.

MR. HASTIE: What the member for West Perth had said about him was absolutely, maliciously, and deliberately untrue.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member should not use those expressions.

MR. HASTIE could use no other words that would express his feelings.

MR. MORAN insisted on a withdrawal.

MR. HASTIE: Of what words? If the hon. member mentioned the words they would be withdrawn. Could the word "untrue" be used?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: "Characteristic" was close enough.

MR. HASTIE: None of the words of the member for West Perth were true. No conference had taken place, and there was no talk between him and the Attorney General. His object in moving to adjourn the debate was that, after listening for a quarter of an hour hearing members talking about the Public Works Department and all sorts of departments, he saw that the member for West Perth was deliberately wasting the time of the Committee and that some other members were deliberately backing up the hon. member.

MR. TAYLOR: The Minister for Works wasted time.

MR. HASTIE: The Minister only replied to some statements made.

MR. MORAN: Was it in order to accuse any member of the House of deliberately wasting time?

THE CHAIRMAN: This was not a point of order, but a personal explanation.

MR. HASTIE: What he said was absolutely true. What was said about him was maliciously false.

MR. MORAN: Those words should be withdrawn.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member should withdraw the words.

MR. HASTIE: Until outside the House he would do so.

MR. MORAN: Could he have the police to protect him?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: In justice to the member for Kanowna, there was absolutely no foundation for the remarks about a conference. Had the member for Kanowna not explained, he (the Attorney General) would have replied to the remarks of the member for West Perth, which otherwise should have been treated with silent contempt.

Motion passed, and leave given to sit again on the next Tuesday.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 9.42 o'clock, until the next Tuesday.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 10th November, 1903.

	PAGE
Questions: Railway Water Haulage, Great Southern	1938
Midland Company's Lands	1938
Bills: Audit Bill, further amendments, Assembly's Message, procedure	1938
Mining Bill, first reading	1939
Dog Bill, Assembly's amendment	1939
Constitution Act Amendment, select committee's recommendations considered, reported	1939
Electoral, select committee's recommendations considered, progress	1937

THE PRESIDENT took the Chair at 4.30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

PAPER PRESENTED.

By the COLONIAL SECRETARY: Fremantle Hospital, Annual Report.

Ordered, to lie on the table.

QUESTION—RAILWAY WATER HAULAGE, GREAT SOUTHERN.

The **HON. J. W. WRIGHT** asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, The number of gallons of water hauled through York by rail for use of Beverley and Great Southern stations for 12 months ending June 12th, 1903. 2, Also cost of same, including railage at classification rates as charged to the public.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1, Beverley, 3,154,000 gallons; Wagin, 490,000; total, 3,644,000. 2, Beverley, £5,948; Wagin, £1,877; total, £7,825.

QUESTION—MIDLAND COMPANY'S LANDS.

HON. J. T. GLOWREY, for **HON. J. M. Drew**, asked the **COLONIAL SECRETARY**: 1, What time elapsed between the Parliamentary approval of the Joint Select Committee's Report on the Midland Railway Company, Ltd., and the notification of the company by the Government that consent would in future be withheld to the sale of land by the company except upon the same conditions as to area, residence, and improvements as apply to Government lands. 2, Whether the lands recorded in Return 29 of 1903 as having been sold, and dated September 1st and September 26th, 1903, respectively, were sold by the company subject to the aforesaid conditions.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1, About 2½ months. The report of the Joint Select Committee was adopted on 28th January, 1902. The company was informed of the intention to refuse consent to farther sales, except under certain new conditions, on 12th April, 1902. 2, No. The amounts set forth on dates mentioned represent progress payments made on account of sales of land, consent to sell which was asked for prior to date of adoption of Select Committee's report. Correspondence 10299/1901.—Application as to Kidman's land is dated 20th September, 1901. Correspondence 13075/1901.—Application as to Phillips' land is dated 22nd November, 1901. Correspondence 3103/1901.—Application as to Redhead's land is dated 8th March, 1901.

AUDIT BILL.

ASSEMBLY'S MESSAGE — PROCEDURE ON THE COUNCIL'S FARTHER SUGGESTIONS.

Message received from the Legislative Assembly, informing the Legislative Council that it was unable to make the farther amendments to the Audit Bill suggested by the Council, it being contrary to Parliamentary practice to make a farther amendment to a Bill which has been previously amended [by request of the other House], and which amendments have been certified to by the Clerk.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (**Hon. W. Kingsmill**): The consideration of this Message must involve a good deal of thought on the part of members of this House. It is necessary that we should proceed with the utmost caution, and avail ourselves of the best possible advice on the points raised in this Message. It is my intention therefore to move that the Message be referred to the Standing Orders Committee, so that the committee can consider it and report to the House on Thursday next. In referring the Message to the Standing Orders Committee, I am aware that the Message does not involve any point that may claim to be directly involved in the Standing Orders; but the Standing Orders Committee is appointed not only for the purpose of advising the House with regard to new or existing Standing Orders, but also for the purpose of advising the House on every such point that may arise. Taking into consideration the fact that we must give a good deal of consideration in our answer to this Message, I think it better that the course I have suggested be adopted. I move "that the Message be referred to the Standing Orders Committee; to report on Thursday next."

HON. G. RANDELL: I agree with the remarks of the leader of the House, that this is an important matter to which we should give careful consideration. I second the motion.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: I was under the apprehension that the Premier would not accept this suggestion when I alluded to it the other day. I think it is the only satisfactory course, as this Message involves a very large question of privilege, that it should be sent to the Standing Orders Committee.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY :

When Dr. Hackett spoke to me with reference to this Message, I took the point of view that it had nothing to do with the Standing Orders Committee. However, because the committee may shed some light on the matter, I have reconsidered my former opinion, and am glad to fall in with the suggestion.

THE PRESIDENT (Sir G. Shenton):

Had it been necessary, I was prepared to give my ruling to-day on this important question, now that it has arisen between the two Houses. I agree with the leader of the House that the matter should be referred to the Standing Orders Committee, by which it can be looked into carefully and reported upon on Thursday next. I have been able to obtain much information on this subject which will be laid before the Committee, so that they can see the exact position of the situation when this clause of the Constitution Act was before the Federal Convention.

Question passed, and the Message referred to the Standing Orders Committee.

MINING BILL.

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

DOG BILL.

ASSEMBLY'S AMENDMENT.

An amendment made by the Assembly was now considered in Committee.

Clause 29—After the word "adult," in line 1, insert the word "male":

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that the amendment be agreed to. The amendment provided that the keeping of dogs by aborigines should be limited to male adult aborigines. He fancied that in the copy of the Bill as it was before members the amendment was to Clause 28 and not to Clause 29, as printed on the Notice Paper. Seeing that the habits of dogs belonging to aborigines were a menace to squatters and farmers, it would not be a bad thing to adopt the amendment, more especially as the aborigines now depended to a very slight extent, he was informed, upon their dogs for hunting purposes.

Question put and passed.

Resolution reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

The Constitution Bill and two other cognate Bills having been referred to a select committee and amended, the amendments made in the first Bill were now regarded as recommendations, and considered in Committee of the whole House.

Clause 1—Short title:

HON. J. W. HACKETT: It being the practice of this House to take the general discussion on the report of a select committee over the motion to adopt the first clause of the Bill, he would now, by permission, follow that course. He appeared before this Committee as chairman of the select committee which had considered this and the other two Bills. His work as chairman had been confined to the very latest stage; the work of keeping the committee straight and correcting its proceedings having been intrusted to the Colonial Secretary. At a very late stage of the committee's work the hon. gentleman had wished to be relieved of those onerous and responsible duties, and suggested that he (Dr. Hackett) should take his place. Against that course he (Dr. Hackett) had protested earnestly, and he now again made his protest. The suggestion, however, had been accepted unanimously by the select committee; and it therefore fell to him now to say a few words about the report presented to this House, the adoption of which was practically now under the consideration of the House. The select committee lost no time over the trust placed in their hands, but held meetings as often as they could, and the attendance was excellent; on many occasions the full committee attending, and on all occasions there being at least six out of the seven members present. Every matter was fully considered, all points being brought up more than once—some points two or three times; and the ultimate decision, which of course must be read in the light of the minutes, must be taken to represent the mature deliberation and determination of the select committee. It was the desire of the select committee to make as few changes as possible in the Bills introduced by the Colonial Secretary; and they farther adopted this general rule, to in no case (only one

slight exception occurring) interfere with the wishes of the Legislative Assembly as regarded the constitution of its own House. The select committee practically confined their discussion to the way in which the Constitution Bill affected the Council. The one slight exception was as to removing the qualifications of electors from the Electoral Act into the Constitution Act, which he trusted would prove acceptable. The task of the select committee was rendered much easier not only by the moderate tone of the Colonial Secretary—who was always moderate except when he had to fight a point against a hostile House—but also the moderation of the Government. After the action of this House, Mr. James's Ministry seemed to have taken the matter seriously into consideration, to have given way where they could, and to have made every endeavour to place before the Council such a measure as its members could fairly accept. The result was that this Bill contained none of those monstrous abnormalities to be found in the Bill of last year. There was only one remnant, which the committee decided to expunge, and that was the proposal that we should commence our Parliamentary year in 1904 with a joint dissolution of both Houses. The marginal note called it a first dissolution of both Houses; but he preferred his own phrase. The object of the clause was to fit in with certain of the proposals of last year; but these having been modified, it was felt they ought to have no place in this year's proposals, and they were deleted. It was a wise thing to do. Under no circumstances and under no stress of argument was it wise to break the continuity of the Legislative Council, and to throw for the time being the two Houses into the melting-pot. To bring this about would not only break one of the conditions on which the Legislative Council was founded, the continuity of existence and opinion; but it would place us in the position that the two Houses would represent the one solitary impulse, whether of excitement, prejudice, or self-interest, that might be agitating the populace on the polling-day. The point need not be laboured, because the Committee would sanction the action of the select committee in recommending that these two clauses be struck out.

The select committee were animated with the desire to make as little change as possible in the proposals of the Ministry, in the hope that the Ministry would meet us, and that both parties would be able to agree upon a workable, reasonable, and just measure of reform for the benefit of the country generally. The suggestions of the select committee being so moderate and so reasonable, it was hoped that the Government would treat them with the same measure of reasonableness and moderation. Except in the matter of striking out Clauses 4 and 5, which was a foregone conclusion, the select committee had made only four changes of any importance. In the first place they had replaced (if it could be called a change of importance which it was to the Council and, he thought, to the Government) the provisions dealing with the qualification of electors in the Constitution Act, by taking them out of the Electoral Act, which was not the proper place for them. There was no precedent for finding them in an Electoral Act, except where the Electoral and Constitution Acts were bound in one.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: There was the precedent of the Commonwealth Parliament.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: The Western Australian Constitution could not be compared to the Commonwealth Constitution, which was a charter that could not be changed except by the most complicated means, involving the expenditure of £100,000. It was clear that matters which might require amendment from time to time should find a place in the Commonwealth Electoral Act, but outside that case there was no instance in Australia where provisions dealing with the qualifications of electors were placed in a purely machinery Bill and excluded from their proper position in a Constitution Act. The second point upon which the select committee agreed was that we should retain the qualifications as before. He (Dr. Hackett) could not concur with any heartiness or cordiality in this recommendation, being distinctly of opinion that it would be to the advantage of the House and country that some reduction of qualification should take place. However a large majority of the committee had decided otherwise, and until he found a strong reason for

doing otherwise he would vote with the other members of the committee to adopt the suggestion as it stood. The third point on which the select committee desired an alteration to the Bill was in the matter of maintaining plural voting. It was felt that we should proceed gradually, that it was sufficient for this reform to apply at first to the Assembly, and that, if it worked well there, it might afterwards be applied to the Council. It was also felt that the Council, representing to a certain degree the interests of property, ought to be particularly careful about weakening the property vote. It was a mandate the Council received, or a trust reposed in their hands, that we should be carefully as possible guard that property and that its rights and obligations should be as little interfered with as possible. The members of the select committee were influenced by the belief that the representation of the North Province would be fundamentally changed. A paper laid before the committee by Mr. Daley, the Inspector of Parliamentary Rolls, showed that for the most part the plural votes cast for the Legislative Council were something under ten per cent., and that in the North Province, where we believed the greatest alteration would be made by the abolition of plural voting, the proportion appeared to be the least. In the North Province there were 363 individual votes and 22 plural votes, a very curious fact. Nevertheless, other reasons were sufficient to justify the Committee, in the present stage of the constitutional reform movement, in accepting the recommendation of the select committee. He (Dr. Hackett) would also be prepared to vote with the members of the select committee on this point. The fourth matter on which the select committee made an alteration to the proposals submitted by the Government was in regard to the referendum. It was recommended that the House should accept a clause as follows:—

No poll of the electors of the State shall be taken and no referendum to the people of the State shall be had unless by the authority of an Act of the Parliament.

This recommendation represented the true constitutional position of the question. A poll of the electors cost money, and that money should not be expended with-

out a vote of Parliament, or without being authorised by an Act. More than that, it was a most delicate business to ascertain the feeling of the people, not the feeling of the one afternoon, but the permanent, set feeling of the people, arrived at after months of consideration, probably years. No appeal to the people to alter the Constitution should be taken except after careful deliberation in Parliament and, if necessary, safeguarded by whatever provisions either House might think fit to impose. He hoped the clause would be adopted. In another part of Australasia there were proposals by a Government with regard to the referendum which were a step towards the abolition of the Upper House. He trusted this House would not believe we had advanced so far as to allow a similar act of destruction to be perpetrated against ourselves. This clause necessitated the Government being responsible for an appeal to the people, whereas if it were left to the resolution of another place any private member could, having obtained the necessary number of votes, move in the matter, and even if the Government voted against the motion they would feel obliged to carry out the mandate of the House. The Electoral Bill, except for the removal of Part III., dealing with the qualification of electors, was unchanged by the select committee to all intents and purposes, because the few formal amendments were consequential on the changes proposed in the Constitution Bill, or were improvements. The select committee recommended two changes, one dealing with the mode of voting and the other with election expenses. The form of voting suggested in the other place was that form with which one was familiar in England and adopted by the Commonwealth Parliament, the use of a square in which the voter placed a cross. In view of the prospect of a number of spoilt votes and of the difficulty voters would have of understanding what was to be done, which had been proved over and over again, the committee decided to revert to the system familiar all over Australia, used in this State for a dozen years and still in force in municipal elections. Whatever happened we should be compelled to have two systems of voting, the Commonwealth and the municipal. By the latter we

should be compelled to strike out the name of the candidate for whom we did not wish to vote. Members would sanction the view of the committee that there was a less chance of errors and irregularities in keeping to this the old system. The municipal elections came more frequently than the Commonwealth elections, so that the balance seemed to be largely in favour of rejecting the innovation of the Government, and of retaining the old system. The second matter on which an alteration was desired was one at the decision of which in the committee he regretted to say he was not present, for had he been present he would have expressed a view somewhat contrary to that of the select committee, and that was with regard to the sum of money which might be placed at the disposal of the candidate for electoral expenses, £500. Following our general principle which had guided us without exception, nothing was said about the provisions relating to the Assembly, but it was proposed that instead of £200 being allowed for electoral expenses in the Council £500 should be granted. He was rather of opinion that was a very high figure, but he would point out in justification of the committee's suggestion that £100 was allowed for a district, and some of the provinces contained four, five, or six districts, and one of them even seven, so that if £100 was permitted for a district, naturally one would expect something of the same proportion to be observed in the provinces. That, however, was a matter which doubtless would be argued by the Colonial Secretary, who might induce the members of the select committee to change their opinion. That practically exhausted the amendments, certainly those of any moment, in the Electoral Bill. There only remained the Redistribution of Seats Bill. In that Bill the committee agreed to two amendments. To one he was sure the Colonial Secretary would offer no objection, this being that the Redistribution of Seats Bill should be subjected, as to its passage through the two Houses, to the same rule as that which affected an alteration of the Constitution, namely, that the second and third readings should be adopted by absolute majorities of the two Houses before the Bill was presented to His Excellency for assent.

That, he was sure, would be satisfactory. This House would, he was convinced, never consent to let a question of redistribution of seats, all-important as it was—for really the man who regulated the redistribution of seats regulated the representation of the country—be passed, except under the same safeguard as now had to be applied to vital constitutional questions. The other alteration was as to the redistribution of provinces, and as far as he could gather the result of the select committee's decision had been to bring back the Bill to a state more palatable to the Ministry of the day. He had had no conversation with the Colonial Secretary and the hon. gentleman's colleagues over the matter, but was satisfied that the proposal of the select committee was infinitely more pleasing to the Premier and his colleagues than the one which the hon. gentleman, after strong protest, allowed to proceed from another place to be considered by the Council. The select committee proposed that there should be 10 provinces, and that practically the 10 provinces should remain as at present, and when the time came to discuss this suggestion abundant reasons would, he believed, be given for it. He thought these were the salient points, in fact almost the only points, with one or two small exceptions, which the committee proposed should be introduced as alterations in the measure. In conclusion he begged the House to remember that the matter had received the most careful and earnest consideration from a very large and representative committee, who believed that if these new provisions were adopted they would be for the good of the country and Parliament generally.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY : Upon the general subject, his remarks would be very brief. He had thought it advisable, as Minister in charge of the Bill, that he should occupy a place on that select committee, and he was glad the House was good enough to elect him. But he did not reckon that he would be met, when the committee assembled with an earnest request to take the chairmanship. He realised to the fullest extent, before accepting the chairmanship, certain disadvantages the occupation of that position would place him under. Might he be permitted to hope other mem-

bers of the committee did not recognise the extent to which he would be handicapped by being chairman? At all events, it gave him the greatest pleasure to be of any assistance, but when it came to signing and presenting the report to Parliament, to all the items of which he could not subscribe, he felt that, having to the best of his ability discharged his duty as chairman, it would be fitting for some other member to present the report. He regretted to say, as Minister in charge of these Bills, that he could not in all respects subscribe to the amendments suggested by the select committee. For instance, and foremost, the question of qualifications of electors for the Council was one on which he must seriously urge the careful consideration of this House before it agreed to leave these qualifications exactly as they were at present. However, he intended to deal somewhat more fully with the subject when we came to that amendment. Again, with regard to the placing of Part III. of the present electoral Bill in the Constitution Bill, he would also request the Committee to carefully consider that point, and ask whether it was not correct that only what we might call organic portions of the Constitution should be in the Constitution Act, and whether we should or should not place in the Constitution a quantity so mutable as the qualifications of electors, because whether these qualifications were changed now or not, they would be changed later on; he felt convinced of that. Perhaps if we decided to change the qualification so that it would be a little less mutable for the future, there might be more excuse for putting this Part III. of the Electoral Bill in the Constitution. He merely threw out that suggestion, which he thought had very excellent reasons to support it. The probabilities were very great that if in the one instance the course of meeting what he believed to be the trend of thought nowadays were adopted, we would render the basis of the Council's existence more secure and more broad, and there would be the greater object in shifting the qualification clauses into the Constitution Bill. If they were not to be shifted, he did not see why the Electoral Bill containing these qualifications should not be qualified, as the committee had recommended that the Redistribution of Seats

Bill should be qualified—and he cordially agreed with them in this—by the safeguard of an absolute majority of both Houses of Parliament being necessary to pass the second and third readings of these measures. With regard to the new clause proposed by Dr. Hackett as to the whole of the electors of the State, he had cordially agreed with the intentions of the committee in this respect, but since thinking the matter over he had come to the conclusion it would be well if that clause were slightly amended. He proposed to move in committee that certain words be added to the effect that—

No poll of the electors of the State shall be taken, and no referendum to the people of the State shall be had, unless by the authority of an Act of the Parliament, where such Bill or referendum raises any question affecting the Constitution of the State.

That, he thought, did not imperil the intention of the select committee, and would render it possible for either or both Houses of Parliament to make an appeal or take a referendum, say on a question such as the State control of the liquor traffic, or anything which did not affect the Constitution. Unless he was mistaken his friend Dr. Hackett would agree with him.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: It should be done on any great question by Act of Parliament.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Quite so. One took it that great questions meant such as involved an alteration of the Constitution. Unless he was mistaken, the question which caused this clause to be inserted was as to altering the Constitution. He was not in conference with the hon. member.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Other questions, too.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It appeared to him that was the motive power which caused Dr. Hackett to propose this clause. As to the report on the Electoral Bill, he certainly agreed in many respects with the recommendation of the select committee; but he must differ in reference to the proposed manner of voting. He wished it were possible to conscientiously and justifiably keep our present method of voting. Undoubtedly it was clear and easily understood, and had been the

practice in the State for some time; but unfortunately, leaving out the question of municipal voting, in the matter of political voting we would have the anomaly of voting on the 16th December by means of a cross within squares, and of being asked at a later date to vote under the old mode as proposed by the select committee. This would give rise to considerable abuse. In the Electoral Bill provision was made so that if the crosses in squares were omitted and a person struck out the names of candidates for whom he did not wish to vote, the ballot would not be informal.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: That showed how doubtful the matter was.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It also showed that the Government wished to meet any mistakes electors might make by adhering to their old form of voting. With several of the minor amendments suggested by the select committee he was very pleased to agree. With regard to the Redistribution of Seats Bill it was his intention to support the Bill as it came from the Legislative Assembly. To the new clause proposed to be added, requiring an absolute majority of the whole of the members in either House for the passage of any Redistribution of Seats Amendment Bill, he would certainly give his most hearty support. He thanked members of the select committee heartily for their kindness and consideration towards him as chairman. He had served on many select committees, but he did not think he ever served on one that went more thoroughly into the subject, and gave it greater thought. When he differed from members of that committee he wished to do so as amicably and as reasonably as possible; and the differences were founded on his own convictions.

First clause put and passed.

Clauses 2, 3—agreed to.

Clause 4—First dissolution of both Houses:

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was possible that the schedule of the Redistribution of Seats Bill might affect this clause. He moved that the clause be postponed.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: How would the voting on the schedule depend on the clause.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: If the schedule of the Redistribution of Seats Bill were carried with alterations to boundaries and names, it might be possible that a dissolution would be necessary. As there was some doubt, he desired to postpone the consideration of these clauses and the consequential amendments involved until after the Redistribution of Seats Bill was considered.

THE CHAIRMAN suggested that progress be reported, and the other Bills gone on with.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: By consenting to a postponement of the clause, members did not commit themselves to anything.

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY: The Bill could be recommitted.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The clause depended on what happened to the schedule.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: From the Minister's remarks one gathered that, certain alterations to the boundaries of provinces taking effect, it would be necessary to send all the members to the electors.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: That was a very strong reason why the clause should be struck out, and the recommendation of the select committee be accepted; for the unfortunate result which the Government invited the House to accept would then be avoided. The House should accept the redistribution of seats proposed by the select committee; but whatever system were adopted, the matter could be easily got over. The question was not a new one. On several occasions there had been alterations to the boundaries of provinces.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: And names.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Names did not matter so long as the boundaries had to be altered. The difficulty was foreseen years ago, and the Parliamentary Draftsman provided a clause to deal with it, which said:—

Notwithstanding the creation of any new province or district, or the alteration of the name or boundaries of any province or district by this Act, every member of the Legislative Council shall continue to represent in Parliament the province of the same name as the province for which he was elected, but

with the boundaries assigned to it by this Act.

If the schedule proposed by the Government were retained, we could adopt this clause, and everything would be set right.

Motion (to postpone) withdrawn.

On motion by **HON. J. W. HACKETT**, Clause 4 struck out.

Clause 5—Issue of writs for new Parliament:

On motion by **HON. J. W. HACKETT**, clause struck out.

Clauses 6 to 10—agreed to.

Clause 11—Tenure of members:

HON. J. W. HACKETT moved that the words "subject to the provisions of this Act as to the retirement of members elected at a general election and," in lines 1 and 2, be struck out.

Amendment passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 12—Rotation of members:

On motion by **HON. J. W. HACKETT**, clause struck out and the following inserted in lieu:—

The senior member of the Council for each Province at the commencement of this Act shall vacate his seat on the twentieth day of May, One thousand nine hundred and four, and the member who in turn becomes senior member shall vacate his seat two years after the day when the previous senior member was required to vacate his seat, and so on with every member who in turn becomes senior member.

Clause 13—agreed to.

Clause 14—Retiring members may sit during election of successors:

On motion by **HON. J. W. HACKETT**, the words "except when the Council is dissolved," in line 2, struck out.

Clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 15 to 18—agreed to.

Clause 19—Quorum:

HON. J. W. HACKETT moved that the words "one-half," in line 1, be struck out, and "one-third" inserted in lieu.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: At one time it was contemplated that the members of the Council should number 24; and as it was thought that eight would be too small a number for deliberation, it was decided that one-half should form a quorum. From the general attendance in the Council we had no difficulty in getting half even now; but what was sauce for the goose was sauce for the gander, and as members in an-

other place had decided that a third of their number could conduct their business, it was not to be expected that the Council would depart from that rule. He had much pleasure in supporting the amendment.

Amendment passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 20 to 34—agreed to.

Clause 35—Qualification of electors:

HON. J. W. HACKETT moved:

That the clause be struck out.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The reason for striking out Clause 35 was, practically, in the first place that the qualification clauses in the Electoral Bill might be embodied in the Constitution Bill, to which he had already entered a protest; and in the second place because in this Bill the principle of plural voting for the Council was abolished. He intended to oppose the striking out of this clause on both those grounds. Now or later the qualifications of electors for the Council would vary considerably, and the qualifications of electors for the Assembly were likely to vary; hence they were both quantities which were changeable, and for that reason they should not find a place in the Constitution Act. As to plural voting, it had been suggested by Dr. Hackett that we should try one thing at a time, and see how the abolition of plural voting acted in the case of the Assembly, and then apply it to the Council. One of the great objections to striking out the system of plural voting in the Council was the disastrous effect which it would have upon the numbers on the roll in the North Province; yet we found, when, after considerable pains a return was prepared by the electoral authorities, that in the North Province the number of plural voters out of the total of 363 only amounted to 22. The districts which would most suffer were those that could best afford to suffer; such as the Metropolitan, the Metropolitan-Suburban, and the West Provinces, where the proportion of plural votes formed a greater percentage of the whole than in any of the other provinces. Strange to say, these provinces were the best fitted to stand any loss of this kind, because they were still left with a very respectable and representative number of electors.

He hoped the Committee would adopt the proposal of the Government, and abolish the system of plural voting for the Council.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: There were a number of reasons, in addition to that referred to by the Colonial Secretary, why plural voting should not be abolished. The argument that it made no difference whether we retained a thing or not always seemed to be one for leaving things as they stood, because needlessly tampering with and altering the Constitution had a great tendency to stir up the public mind. As to the North Province, it would be a good thing to increase the number of 22 instead of reducing it. He could not understand how the number of plural votes was so small. Probably a much larger number of persons was qualified, but perhaps the difficulty of getting on the roll at this distance had operated in that direction. At all events he begged the Committee to give this constitutional provision another chance. The Colonial Secretary had said he was certain the provision would be repealed in course of time. However, let the experiment stand a little longer. We would see how far, with the improved means of getting the electors on the roll, the number of plural votes in the North Province would increase.

SIR E. H. WITTENOOM: As before stated, he was in favour of plural voting. Every man should have a vote; every man should have a right to say under what laws he should live and what taxes he should pay; but he (Sir E. H. Wittenoom) went a little farther and thought those people who displayed industry and intelligence should have a little more recognition than those who had hardly any stake or perhaps none in the country. The only way this could be achieved was by letting those who represented interests have plural votes at all events for this House. His private opinion was that there should be plural voting for the Assembly as well. A man, whatever he might be, whether a squatter, engine-driver, or merchant, if he lived in one town or district and had enough progress about him to spend his money in developing other portions of the State, should have a say as to who should represent him in those portions. Every

person in a municipality had that right, and therefore it was hardly unfair that the same principle should prevail in connection with politics. The principle of one adult one vote existed in relation to the Assembly, so there should be plural voting in connection with the provinces. Under the circumstances he thought the Committee would support such a reasonable proposition as this, and if the time arrived which we all looked forward to when everybody would be in the same position, and be endowed with intelligence and wealth, then perhaps we could have one vote all round.

HON. B. C. O'BRIEN: The select committee's amendment should not be carried into effect, for he by no means believed in plural voting as it affected the Upper House. He was a little surprised to hear the remarks of Dr. Hackett, who was not often inconsistent, but was slightly so on this occasion. The hon. member was in favour of plural voting, yet was anxious that the qualifications of electors for the Upper Chamber should be reduced. As to the remarks of Sir E. H. Wittenoom that persons who by their thrift or intelligence had become wealthy should have two votes, it was not always through thrift and intelligence that people became possessed of property. The ambition of everybody was to become wealthy if possible, and the fact that a person by a little stroke of luck became a little more wealthy than another was no reason why he should have an extra vote.

HON. E. McLARTY: Having a knowledge of the North Province, the number mentioned was a very small proportion of those entitled to vote. He did not know for what reason, but a year or two ago a number of electors on the rolls for the North were struck off, he himself amongst them. He had a vote for years, but all at once found his name was taken off the rolls, and he did not know for what reason. He believed the same applied to a good many others. No doubt the number of plural voters seemed small, and it was so in comparison with the total number on the rolls.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was correct.

HON. E. McLARTY: Others beside himself had been struck off the roll. The man who had intelligence and spent his money in different parts of the State

should have a right to a voice in the election of members in the different districts. He would support the amendment.

HON. J. A. THOMSON: It would make no difference to the House with regard to the decision on this point for him to express his opinion, but he had always been against plural voting. It was surely enough for a resident of the State to have one vote. What was the use of making the franchise for the Legislative Assembly liberal if we restricted the franchise for the Upper House and granted plural voting? It was a mistake to say that the system of plural voting would continue for a long time, for the feeling all throughout Australia was against it. If the Commonwealth Parliament adopted the one adult one vote principle in elections for the Upper House, there was no reason why we should not adopt the principle in elections for the Legislative Council in Western Australia.

HON. W. MALEY: The man of property was quite sufficiently represented by the existence of the Upper Chamber. If every adult individual had a vote for the Lower House the individual was sufficiently represented, but those individuals who exhibited prudence, thrift, and economy and obtained property had their interests properly represented in the Council by a single vote system. If a vote was given to property it was not given to intelligence and industry, and the property vote of a man gave no estimate of his intelligence. The vote of the man in Albany owning property in Perth was counterbalanced by the vote of the Perth man owning property in Albany. There was no wisdom in giving a vote to a thing, but there was reason in giving a vote to a principle such as intelligence, thrift, or industry. He would in every instance support the abolition of plural voting, contending that the greatest safeguard of property was in the qualification of £25 per annum. He opposed any reduction in the qualification, and was very sorry that one member of the select committee should have been so persistent in advocating a reduction of that qualification. In view of the light of past events where a certain section of the community had been endeavouring to take the political helm, one should proceed very carefully

in reducing the qualification of the value of property with a single vote system which he hoped some day to see exercised in elections for the Legislative Council.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER: It would be an injustice not to allow plural voting, and to say that we should preclude a man because he had intelligence, industry, and application to business, and acquired property in several places, from voting in several places. The power to vote should never have been given to those who had no right to it. It was wrong to say that a man who could just eke out an existence was entitled to vote equally with the man who had intelligence. However, by extending the single vote system to the Legislative Assembly we had done all that could be reasonably expected of us.

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

Ayes	15
Noes	8

Majority for ... 7

AYES.
Hon. G. Bellingham
Hon. A. Dempster
Hon. J. W. Hackett
Hon. S. J. Haynes
Hon. Z. Lane
Hon. W. T. Loton
Hon. E. McLarty
Hon. C. A. Piesse
Hon. G. Randall
Hon. Sir George Shenton
Hon. C. Sommers
Hon. F. M. Stone
Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom
Hon. J. W. Wright
Hon. C. E. Dempster
(Teller).

NOES.
Hon. T. F. O. Brimage
Hon. J. D. Connolly
Hon. J. T. Glowray
Hon. A. G. Jenkins
Hon. W. Kingsmill
Hon. W. Maley
Hon. B. C. O'Brien
Hon. J. A. Thomson
(Teller).

Amendment thus passed, and the clause struck out.

Clauses 36 to 42—agreed to.

Clause 43—Vacancy on happening of disqualification:

HON. J. W. HACKETT moved that the words "other services rendered to State or" be added after "honorarium," in line 2.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY opposed the amendment. If the words should be added at all, they should be added to Clause 42. He did not think the amendment would have a good effect. It practically meant that members of Parliament were to be debarred, unless they belonged to a company, from serving the State and receiving any pecuniary benefit therefrom. There were many members of Parliament who gave a great

deal of attention to the State outside Parliament, perhaps as members of commissions which were often productive of very good results. Members were prone to declare that Royal Commissions never did any good. Still there were numerous instances where they did a great deal of good. Again the amendment would be a distinct deterrent to a class of persons who should be in Parliament (members of the legal fraternity) from entering Parliament. If a good lawyer, a man with an extensive practice, knew that by entering Parliament he debarred himself absolutely from any Government work, that would have a deterrent effect on Parliament, which would very likely be the loser. It was to be hoped the amendment would not be passed.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: The object of the amendment was to make it clearer that persons who obtained pecuniary benefits or emoluments from the Government should not enjoy them whilst they sat in Parliament, and give a vote supposed to be honest and fair, but which might be more or less influenced by the pecuniary advantage received from the Government. We knew the abuses in regard to this in the past; he could mention several instances even in Western Australia in the case of professional men in the past; and it was nothing less than a crying scandal that lawyers should be allowed to sit in Parliament and obtain large briefs from the Government, with whose views at the time they were not in accord. The words the select committee proposed to insert were taken from the Commonwealth Act; therefore he appealed to members who believed the Commonwealth Act was the last word of wisdom in these States, to vote in favour of the suggestion of the select committee.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: If this proposal were carried, it would be only fair and reasonable on recommitment to get the Committee to consent to strike out the last subclause of Clause 42, which contained the words "has any direct or indirect pecuniary interest in any agreement with the Public Service of the State."

HON. F. M. STONE: If this amendment were carried, no King's Counsel would be in a position to become a member of either House, for a King's Counsel was

bound to accept a brief on behalf of the Crown. The Committee should not be carried to such extreme as to wish that certain members who had been ornaments to both Houses, and were King's Counsel, should be debarred from entering Parliament. The leader of the present Government was a King's Counsel, and we had had other King's Counsel as Attorney General. This suggestion, if adopted, would prevent those gentlemen and members of that class from being elected. Moreover it would prevent not only King's Counsel but also their partners from entering Parliament. Fortunately he himself was the partner of a King's Counsel, and he (Mr. Stone) would be indirectly interested if his partner accepted a brief from the Crown, which that partner was bound to accept, being a King's Counsel.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Then the hon. member should be unseated and fined £500.

HON. F. M. STONE: In regard to another place also he thought nearly all the profession in that House would be unseated.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: The amendment was taken directly from the Commonwealth Act, which was agreed to after three conventions, where the lawyers had not exactly a majority, but the major influence. As far as King's Counsel were concerned, he thought the hon. member had gone farther than was correct. We knew a King's Counsel was bound to accept a fee, in fiction, and that before he defended a person he had to obtain leave, in fiction. If a King's Counsel was in Parliament, it was the duty of Parliament to bar him from receiving a single penny from the Government. If he accepted payment, we could not trust his integrity. As to a partner, that had been considered, and as far as he (Dr. Hackett) remembered it was decided that, if the partner were in Parliament, the partner would not be invalidated through the King's Counsel receiving something from the Crown; but that partner must not benefit in the least, or if he did it would be an open disgrace for him to sit in Parliament pretending to give his opinion freely and impartially, and yet knowing that by the back door a fee was coming into his pocket from the Government

which he was either pretending to oppose or pretending to support.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The circumstances of the Commonwealth were so absolutely different from those of this State that he did not see why we should follow the example of the Commonwealth in this matter, although it might be correct and legitimate to follow them in other instances. The Commonwealth Parliament consisted of a body of legislators with a Government that had practically no concrete work to do, whereas the State had to administer its own affairs, and make many more inquiries, and had a greater amount of work at its disposal, with less people to give it to. Moreover, the small size of our community rendered it imperative that we should have a choice of the best men to represent the community in Parliament. If by passing this clause we debarred any of the brightest members of the community from taking a seat in Parliament, we should be doing an injustice to the community. For these reasons he hoped the Committee would pause before inserting this provision.

HON. G. RANDELL: It was highly desirable for Parliament to keep the public affairs of this country as clean as possible, and this proposal was one way by which we could take a step in that direction.

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY: We should do everything we could to keep politics as clean as possible, and this proposal was a step in that direction. There seemed to be a wail raised about the harm it would do to one particular profession—the lawyers. The Colonial Secretary seemed to think it would be very hard that the Government could not get the services of the best talent in that profession. Was it not also very hard that they could not get the services of the best talent in any other profession? Why should the lawyers be made an exception more than any other profession? He regretted the amendment had not gone farther. In New South Wales where gross scandals had been perpetrated, some years ago not only the Attorney General but the Minister for Public Works, who was also a leading lawyer, accepted briefs in cases of the Crown. In one case the Minister for Works was against his own department. What happened in New

South Wales might happen in Western Australia. He thought that in another instance the Attorney General was engaged in a suit against the Government.

HON. F. M. STONE: The argument used was, apparently, that members should be above a bribe of any kind, that members of the legal profession should not be bribed by fees, and that members in trade should not be bribed by the trade they got from the Government. If we were going to follow that principle, we should do away with a provision which enabled incorporated companies to receive any fee or contract from the Government. There was nothing to prevent a trading company from turning itself into a private company.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: How many members?

HON. F. M. STONE: Seven.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Twenty.

HON. F. M. STONE: What he was thinking of was the Companies Act; but even taking 20, how easy it was for one person to let 20 shares be distributed amongst his friends. That was done every day. People could make their relations or intimate friends become members of a company, which would thus be really a one-man company. There were hundreds of companies of that nature in England, and a considerable number in this State. A doctor might be called in in the event of a railway accident, and if in the employment of the Government he would be debarred from taking fees. Or, again, take the case of an architect. There had not been a breath of suspicion against the legal profession, the doctors, or the architectural profession in this State that fees had been paid them by the Government with the object of getting their support.

At 6:33, the CHAIRMAN left the Chair.
At 7:30, Chair resumed.

HON. F. M. STONE: The remarks of Mr. Randell caused him some surprise. The hon. gentleman sneered at the legal profession.

HON. GEORGE RANDELL: The reference was only to the legal aspect of the question.

HON. F. M. STONE: The amendment also affected members sitting on boards. The State would be prevented

from getting the services of many gentlemen. One board in question was the Agricultural Advisory Board.

HON. W. T. LOTON: A special Act protected members of that board.

HON. F. M. STONE: Why should the members of that board be exempted? If it were done in one case other boards should be exempted. Members who sat on Royal Commissions were paid for their services. Members of the Central Board of Health received an honorarium. Did the members of the Hospital Board receive an honorarium.

HON. GEORGE RANDELL: They only got an abuse.

HON. F. M. STONE: The services of members on that board were worth fees. If we passed the amendment its effect would be far-reaching. To be logical in respect to Acts referring to boards we should adopt the principle that no fees shall be paid to any member of Parliament. The clause would prevent the State from obtaining the services of legal gentlemen, and there was no demand in that direction. The partners of a member of Parliament would be precluded from accepting payment from the State. No injustice had been done by reason of persons being allowed to accept honorariums. No doubt the Commonwealth had a law similar to the proposed amendment, but there was a very large area of selection outside the Commonwealth Parliament. However, the Commonwealth law was found rather impracticable, as it prevented the Commonwealth Government from obtaining the services of the best men in the legal profession. Western Australia being at present so small, the Government would be debarred from getting the best services of professional men, and the best professional men would be debarred from going into Parliament. Unless it could be proved that an injustice would work out, or that we should have bribery wholesale, there was no necessity for passing the amendment.

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

Ayes	20
Noes	3
Majority for	17

AYES.
 Hon. G. Bellingham
 Hon. J. D. Connolly
 Hon. A. Dempster
 Hon. C. E. Dempster
 Hon. J. M. Drew
 Hon. J. T. Glowrey
 Hon. J. W. Hackett
 Hon. S. J. Haynes
 Hon. A. G. Jenkins
 Hon. B. Laurie
 Hon. W. T. Loton
 Hon. W. Maley
 Hon. E. McLarty
 Hon. B. C. O'Brien
 Hon. C. A. Piesse
 Hon. G. Randall
 Hon. C. Sommers
 Hon. J. A. Thomson
 Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom
 Hon. T. F. O. Brimage
 (Teller).

NOES.
 Hon. W. Kingsmill
 Hon. F. M. Stone
 Hon. J. W. Wright
 (Teller).

Amendment thus passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 44 to 51—agreed to.

Clause 52—Salary of President and Speaker:

HON. J. W. HACKETT moved—

That the clause be struck out.

This clause and the next were part of the Constitution Act of 1899. That section, however, referring to these subjects was struck out by the first schedule. It would be seen that Sections 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 15, and 35 being inserted there repealed that section in the Constitution Act of 1899. The amendment would eliminate Section 35 in the first schedule, and would leave the law as it stood. It was therefore proposed to leave it so, and that would necessitate striking out these two clauses, which would then be redundant.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was his duty to oppose this amendment, on strictly utilitarian grounds. It was proposed by this amendment to strike out those two clauses, which provided for equality of payment only for the President of the Council and the Speaker of the Assembly, for also putting the two heads of the respective Houses, the Chairman of Committees and the Clerk of each House, on an equal footing. Speaking without disrespect of the officials of the Council, he did not think anyone could contend for a moment that the work in this Chamber was at all commensurate with the work in the other; so devices had to be resorted to in the payment of officials in another place, which should not have to be resorted to. Those officials got certain pay altogether out of proportion to the work done. The Clerk of the Assembly got a fee for acting as

Librarian, and could not possibly do any work as such. But the difference in the work between the two Houses was recognised, and, without casting any reflection upon those gentlemen who so ably did the work intrusted to their charge in this Chamber, there was absolutely no comparison between the work in this House and that in the other in the way of hours or anything else. The question of the dignity of the two Houses should not be allowed to enter into this matter at all. That was raising a false issue, and an issue which he regretted to say sometimes led to most disastrous results. The dignity of the two Houses should not militate against the interests of the community; moreover, the dignity of this Chamber was by no means hurt by paying officials of the House according to the work they did. If the officials of another place did more work they should get more pay.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: One had a sufficiently good opinion of the feelings of the Colonial Secretary towards this House to be satisfied the hon. gentleman would be much hurt if this amendment were not carried. Why should the salaries not be on the same footing? If the hon. gentleman thought a distinction should be made, presumably he would be consistent enough to say, when we came to Clause 54, that if £200 was sufficient for a member of the Assembly it was more than enough for a member of this House.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: That was a question of responsibility.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Why should the hon. gentleman fix on the two clerks to display this utilitarian spirit? We wanted salaries which would not put us in a position of inferiority to another place, and salaries to our clerks which would enable them to have a living wage. Our clerk, who was the Clerk of Parliaments as well as Clerk to the Council, had large and multifarious duties cast upon him as Clerk of Parliaments, quite distinct from the duty exercised as Clerk of this House. The clerk in another place got £450. He had more work to do, but received an additional £150 a year, making a total of £600, and that was quite a sufficient concession for the extra work he was supposed to do. But our "Black Rod" received the munificent

salary of £225, which was less than should be given, considering the amount of intelligence required. The officers of this House required the same education, knowledge, and intelligence as those elsewhere. In the same way with the Chairman of Committees, why should we stigmatise him as unfitted to receive the same salary as the Chairman of Committees in another place? The thing would not bear examination for a moment. Why did the hon. gentleman single out the President and Speaker and place them on a special pedestal? They were to be made equal, but the rest of our officials were degraded.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The hon. member knew perfectly well the position taken by him. (the Minister) was strictly logical, but although he occupied a logical position it was difficult for him to speak upon this point, more especially in the presence of those gentlemen whom he was not criticising but whom it affected, yet the hon. member endeavoured to make the position harder. That was manifestly unfair. No reduction was contemplated in the salaries of the officers of this House, but, as the hon. member acknowledged, the work in another place was much greater than the work here. The dignity of this House was as dear to him (the Minister) as to any other member, but we should not, from a false sense of it, say the clerks in another place, who had much more work to do than the clerks in this Chamber, should not get paid more. As to payment of members, the argument used was a little bit of sophistry. A member of Parliament was paid for the responsibility, and the responsibility of a member of the Council was, on account of the lesser number of members, rather greater than that of a member of another place. The officers of this House fortunately did not have to sit up till one or two, or perhaps five or six in the morning.

MEMBER: They had to sit up all night on one occasion.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: They had on one occasion, he believed, to sit up all night; still if the whole time of the officials of this House was taken up, how did the clerks in another place get time enough to do their work? This was not a matter in which the dignity of

the House would suffer one little bit. The dignity of the House was above such an argument.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: What was said in half-jest showed how fully it was meant. After all, the importance of officers in this State was measured by salaries, and one only needed to listen to the debate on the Estimates in the Assembly to ascertain this. The officers of both Houses should stand in absolutely identical positions, and it was in the best interests of the House that it should be so.

Amendment passed, and the clause struck out.

Clause 53—Chief Clerk:

On motion by Hon. J. W. HACKETT clause struck out.

Clause 54—Allowances to Members:

On motion by Hon. J. W. HACKETT, the word "official" was inserted after "any," in line 5.

Clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 55 to end—agreed to.

First Schedule:

On motion by Hon. J. W. HACKETT, the figures "35," in line 1, were struck out.

Schedule as amended agreed to.

Second Schedule—agreed to.

New Clause—Qualification of electors (Council):

HON. J. W. HACKETT moved that the following be added as Clause 35:—

Subject to the disqualification hereinafter stated, every person not under twenty-one years of age, whether male or female—who is a natural born or naturalised subject of the King, and has lived in Western Australia for six months continuously; and who, within any province—1, Has a legal or equitable freehold estate in possession of the clear value of one hundred pounds; or 2, Has a leasehold estate of possession of the clear value of one hundred pounds with the right to acquire the freehold on the performance of any conditions; or 3, Has a leasehold estate in possession of the clear annual value of twenty-five pounds, the lease having not less than eighteen months to run; or 4, Occupies a dwelling-house of the clear annual value of twenty-five pounds, and has occupied the same for six months next before the time of making his claim; or 5, Holds a lease or license from the Crown to depasture, occupy, cultivate, or mine upon land, at a rental of not less than ten pounds a year, and has held the same for six months next before the time of making his claim; or 6, Is registered on the electoral list of any municipality or road district in respect of property within the province of the annual

rateable value of not less than twenty-five pounds—shall be entitled to be registered on the electoral roll for the province, and, when registered, to vote at the election of members of the Council for every province in respect of which such person is so qualified. Provided that the names of all persons who have been struck off any municipal or road board electoral list on the ground of non-payment of rates shall be deemed for the purposes of this Act to be on such lists respectively.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY:

This clause should certainly not form part of the Constitution Bill. In the near future there would be changes probably in the qualification of the electors, for the Assembly, and possibly in the qualification of electors for the Council. If the clause was put in the Constitution Bill, once a change was to be made the whole question of the Constitution was laid open to the probing of every member of each House. Only what could be described as the organic material of the Constitution should be placed in the Constitution Act. Our Constitution should be just as impregnable as that of the Commonwealth. In the circumstances we were making a mistake by placing a clause relating to the qualification of electors in our Constitution Act.

SIR E. H. WITTENOOM: The majority of members should support the recommendation of the select committee. Surely if there was anything fundamental in connection with the Legislative Council it was the qualification of electors. If we were to have the same qualification for both Houses, we might just as well do away with the Upper House. We did not want the two Houses elected by the same class of electors. Having arrived at a fair qualification for electors to the Council, it seemed to be reasonable to put it into the Constitution. The members of the select committee were not unanimous with regard to the amount of qualification; but as there was no demand on the part of the country for a reduction, there was then no necessity to make an alteration in a condition which apparently gave universal satisfaction. Some members might have been returned to the House pledged to maintain the qualification. There certainly was some slight demand for reduction, otherwise it would not have come up from the Legislative Assembly; but by making any reduction we would allow

that there was reason in the demand. Should we admit the demand at all, it simply became a matter of proportion. There being no demand from the public for any reduction, it was unnecessary for the House to take the matter in hand; and the clause should be put in the Constitution Bill, so that the franchise would be maintained as at present.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: Did the clause apply to conditional purchase holders?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was provided for that purpose.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: The select committee should be congratulated for considering that body of men.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The qualification was too high for them.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: It was matter for regret that the select committee had not gone farther and attempted to liberalise the qualification. There should be some reduction, though not to the extent asked for by the Legislative Assembly.

SIR E. WITTENOOM: Who wanted a reduction?

HON. C. A. PIESSE: Those who lived in £10 or £15 houses. The man who lived in a £15 house was quite as good as a man who lived in a £25 house. We should give some reduction. Now we simply said that we were powerful and were going to stay so. It was no doubt useless to insist upon a reduction in the qualification, but members should give the matter some consideration, and should not stand so hard and fast. He would vote in favour of reducing the qualification to a fairly liberal extent.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The amendment had placed him in a peculiar position. If the qualification was to be reduced we should move to strike out the words "twenty-five pounds" in a clause which he did not think should be in the Constitutional Bill; but that was not the legitimate way of approaching the subject. It was a fairer method to approach it from the lower grade first. The £10 qualification was rather low. The Government at first proposed that it should be £15, and he would be pleased if the Council would adopt this as the limit. The Council would do well to establish itself on as firm a basis as possible, and a basis in which the electors were qualified by the possession of leasehold property of slightly less value than at present

was required, was immeasurably stronger for the future of the House than the proposal to maintain the present qualification. What was sought for in an elector for the Legislative Council was the property-holding instinct, and a £15 house was just as precious to the occupier of it as was a £250 house to the man who occupied such house. It was rather harsh to fix so high a figure as was sought to be done by this amendment. The adoption of the lower scale of qualification would be the strongest weapon with which the Council could arm itself for the future.

HON. S. J. HAYNES: There would be an outcry to reduce it still lower.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: That in his opinion would not be the case, but the outcry which would go up to reduce the present qualification when it was found that the members of this House were failing to do so would be a hard one to meet, and it would be very hard to give reasons why it should not be met. It had been said there had been no demand for this in the past, but this demand was made by the representatives in another place, and that was a substantial demand in itself which he hoped this Chamber would meet at all events in part if not wholly. These clauses couched as they were placed him in a false position. He moved that the words "one hundred," in Subclause 1, be struck out for the purpose of inserting "fifty" in lieu.

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

Ayes	5
Noes	19

Majority against ... 14

AYES.	NOES.
Hon. T. F. O. Brimage	Hon. G. Bellingham
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. J. D. Connelly
Hon. W. Kingmill	Hon. A. Dempster
Hon. J. A. Thomson	Hon. C. E. Dempster
Hon. B. C. O'Brien	Hon. J. T. Glowrey
(Teller).	Hon. J. W. Hackett
	Hon. S. J. Haynes
	Hon. A. G. Jenkins
	Hon. R. Laurie
	Hon. W. T. Loton
	Hon. W. Malley
	Hon. C. A. Piesse
	Hon. G. Randall
	Hon. Sir George Shenton
	Hon. C. Sommers
	Hon. F. M. Stone
	Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom
	Hon. J. W. Wright
	Hon. E. McLarty (Teller).

Amendment thus negatived.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that the words "twenty-five" be struck out of Subclause 3, with a view to inserting "fifteen." There was undoubtedly a feeling, which was manifested before the Bill reached this Chamber, that the present qualification was too high.

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

Ayes	6
Noes	18

Majority against ... 12

AYES.	NOES.
Hon. T. F. O. Brimage	Hon. G. Bellingham
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. J. D. Connolly
Hon. W. Kingsmill	Hon. A. Dempster
Hon. C. A. Piesse	Hon. C. E. Dempster
Hon. J. A. Thomson	Hon. J. T. Glowrey
Hon. B. C. O'Brien	Hon. J. W. Hackett
(Teller).	Hon. S. J. Haynes
	Hon. A. G. Jenkins
	Hon. R. Laurie
	Hon. W. T. Loton
	Hon. E. McLarty
	Hon. G. Randall
	Hon. Sir George Shenton
	Hon. C. Sommers
	Hon. F. M. Stone
	Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom
	Hon. J. W. Wright
	Hon. W. Mailey (Teller).

Amendment thus negatived.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: What he wished to do was to ascertain, if possible, the exact feeling of this Chamber about these qualifications. Therefore he moved that the word "five" be struck out of Subclause 4, thereby making the amount £20 instead of £25.

HON. J. W. HACKETT would not vote for the amendment; for though it commended itself very much to his approval, he preferred to see how the amendments were received elsewhere. If there was a certainty of the Bill being lost, he asked no stronger justification for what had been done. In many instances the House had shown a most conciliatory disposition to meet another place; but whenever the Council took a stand, its action was misunderstood and treated with contumely. He hoped the amendments made would be considered reasonable in another place.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: The amendment proposed by the Colonial Secretary was more likely to receive support, and was more in keeping with the desires of the people. Only a moderate reduction was suggested, and it should be adopted by

the House. Why should we not endeavour to meet the wishes of another place, though there was no desire that we should go to an extreme?

HON. S. J. HAYNES: The recommendation of the select committee should be adopted. The feeling of members was that the franchise was already low enough. Very few persons in the State paying less than £25 were worthy of the franchise, and it would be detrimental to the present electoral interests to make a reduction. The public had not cried out for any change, and the only demand came from another place.

SIR E. H. WITTENOOM: It was now a question of whether the present qualification was right or wrong. There was no demand except from another place for a reduction. If we once reduced the qualification we admitted that there was right in the claim from another place, and having admitted so much it only became a question of proportion. He was not prepared to admit that the present franchise was wrong, but if we did admit that point there would be constant demands for farther reductions.

HON. J. A. THOMSON supported the amendment to reduce the qualification to £20. He did not favour the retention of a second Chamber, but believed the electors could abolish it themselves if the franchise were lowered. If members were afraid to give the electors of the State the power to vote for them, we were indeed poor representatives. It was said there was no outcry for a reduction of the franchise by the electors. That was granted; but the electors of the Assembly cried out that they should be allowed to vote for the Legislative Council. It was admitted that householders should have a vote for the Legislative Council, and that being the case the poorest householder should have the right to a vote. Many householders in this State found it very hard to pay six shillings a week in rent, and they were the best people to have in the State, because they had large families. Were we to debar them from voting? Members had only to proceed in the direction they were following a little longer and there would be such an outcry in the State that would sweep the House away entirely. He did not believe in

extremes, and was quite prepared to accept a small lowering of the franchise, because it was a step in the right direction. If the House held its present attitude it would be good-by to the second Chamber in Western Australia.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY : While welcoming the support of Mr. Thomson, he was actuated by altogether different motives. It was his opinion that by lowering the franchise we would bring about the safety of the Upper House.

SIR E. H. WITTENOOM : Whom should members believe ?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY : In cases of doubt, it was always as well to stick to the Minister in charge of the Bill. The outcry against the Upper House was due to the discontent of those people who did not have votes for the Upper House. The Government did not advocate the abolition of the Upper House. Personally, he hoped that it would never be destroyed, for it would be an evil day for the State or for any other State when the Upper House would be abolished. He firmly believed that the best way to preserve the Upper House was to place it on a fair, broad and equitable basis by a reduction of the franchise.

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY : What addition would there be to the electors by reducing the qualification ?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY : The hon. gentleman knew from his experience on the select committee that the question could not be answered. He asked for reduction on the ground of its being a fair thing. Members in their own interests should accept the amendment.

HON. J. A. THOMSON : And save their souls.

HON. C. A. PIESSE : Although he had intended to vote for the amendment he now intended to oppose it as a protest against the policy mentioned by Mr. Thomson who, having given expression to such views, apparently had no right to be in the House.

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

Ayes	5
Noes	19
				—
Majority against			...	14

ATES.
HON. J. M. DREW
HON. W. KINGSMILL
HON. B. C. O'BRIEN
HON. J. A. THOMSON
HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE
(Teller).

NOES.
HON. G. BELLINGHAM
HON. J. D. CONNOLLY
HON. A. DEMPSTER
HON. J. T. GLOWREY
HON. J. W. HACKETT
HON. S. J. HAYNES
HON. A. G. JENKINS
HON. R. LAURIE
HON. W. T. LOTON
HON. W. MALEY
HON. E. McLARTY
HON. C. A. PIESSE
HON. G. RANDALL
HON. SIR GEORGE SHENTON
HON. C. SOMMERS
HON. F. M. STONE
HON. SIR E. H. WITTENOOM
HON. J. W. WRIGHT
HON. C. E. DEMPSTER
(Teller).

Amendment thus negatived.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY : One was sorry for the trouble he put members to in causing so many to cross the floor so often, but he did it simply because he desired to find out the opinion of the Committee, and he had found it out pretty conclusively. He did not propose to divide the Committee any more on this clause. Still it was a matter of regret to him as being in charge of the Bill, and he thought it would be so to the House as a whole, that none of the many amendments he had moved were accepted. There was nothing left for him but to accept the clause. With the latter part of the clause, for making use of the electoral rolls of municipalities and roads boards, he cordially agreed.

Clause passed, and added to the Bill.

New Clauses :

On motions by the **HON. J. W. HACKETT**, eight new clauses were added without discussion, as follow :—

Qualifications of Electors (Assembly).

36. Subject to the disqualifications herein-after stated, every person not under twenty-one years of age, whether male or female, who is a natural born or naturalised subject of the King, and has resided in Western Australia for six months continuously, shall be entitled to be registered on the electoral roll for the district in which such person resides, and, when registered, to vote at the election of a member of the Assembly for such district.

Qualification for seamen and pearlers.

37. 1. For the purpose of acquiring a qualification as an elector, a seaman shall be deemed to reside in Western Australia during the time he is employed in any ship engaged in the coasting or pearling trade of the State.

2. Every seaman who is entitled to be registered as an elector, and has no settled residence in any district, may be registered in the district in which the principal port at which the ship in which he is employed usually calls is situated.

3. The word "seaman" includes every person who is engaged in any capacity on board any ship not propelled by oars.

4. A ship shall not be deemed engaged in the coasting trade of the State if such ship trades, plies, or goes to or from any port or place without the State.

Disqualification of electors.

38. No person who is of unsound mind, and no person attainted of treason, or who has been convicted and is under sentence, or subject to be sentenced for any offence punishable under the law of any part of the King's dominions by imprisonment for one year or longer, shall be entitled to be registered on any electoral roll, or to vote at any election.

Aboriginal natives not to be registered.

39. No aboriginal native of Australia, Asia, or Africa shall be entitled to be registered as an elector unless registered on an existing roll at the commencement of this Act.

Joint owners and occupiers.

40. Each of several joint owners, occupiers, leaseholders, or licensees, not exceeding four, shall, subject to the provisions of this Act, be entitled to be registered as an elector for the province in case the value of the individual interest of any such person separately considered would entitle such person to be registered.

One vote only for Assembly.

41. No person may, at the same time, be registered on more than one Assembly roll; and in the choosing of members for the Assembly each elector shall vote once only.

No person to be registered more than once for any one province.

42. No person possessing more than one qualification within a province is thereby entitled to be registered more than once for that province; and in choosing members for the Council each elector shall vote once only in each province in which he is entitled to vote.

No action to lie against officials of either House.

59. No action or other legal proceedings shall lie or be maintained against the President of the Council or the Speaker of the Assembly or against the Chairman of Committees, or other officer of either House of the Parliament, or against any other person, for anything done by, or under the warrant, or by the direction of the President, Speaker, or such other officer, under or purporting to be under the Standing Orders or other the order or resolution of the House in which he presides, or of which he is an officer, as the case may be, or under or purporting to be under the provisions of the Act passed in the fifty-fourth year of Her late Majesty, and intitled "An Act for defining the Privileges, Immunities, and Powers of the Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly of Western Australia, respectively."

New Clause—No referendum without authority of an Act:

HON. J. W. HACKETT moved that the following be added as Clause 60:—

No poll of the electors of the State shall be taken, and no referendum to the people of the State shall be had, unless by the authority of an Act of the Parliament.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that there be added to the clause these words:

Where such poll or referendum raises any question affecting the Constitution of the State.

He asked Dr. Hackett to agree to that addition. In dealing with minor matters the formality of an Act should not have to be resorted to. It might be possible in future to take the opinion of the people upon other matters not affecting the Constitution nor involving any alteration in the relations of the two Houses.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: The hon. gentleman would not, he hoped, press the amendment. The very wording of the phrase would allow referendums to be taken not touching the Constitution but involving an alteration which must lead to a change of the Constitution, and the Government would plead this as being a mandate of the people. An abstract principle might be embodied in a referendum, and the Government might insist that it authorised them to effect an alteration of the Constitution.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: How it was possible he did not see.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Supposing a referendum were taken to reduce the provinces to seven?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: That would be an alteration of the Constitution.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Oh, no. It was taken out of the Constitution and put in the Redistribution Bill. The referendum was a most unsatisfactory way of ascertaining the feelings of the people, unless there was a great and general wave of enthusiasm.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: If the hon. member would turn to Clause 8 of the Constitution Bill, he would find it specified the number of provinces.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: In having a referendum, one should be sure of obtaining the real and not a nominal or sham voice of the people. If a Bill were

sent to the electors, there should be a clause that the votes of a certain proportion of the electors should be obtained before the measure could pass. The matter would have to be hedged round with so many safeguards and provisions that an Act of Parliament would be obviously essential. The hon. gentleman thought the only thing on which it would be worth while taking a poll of the people and upsetting the country was a Constitutional measure.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: That appeared to be the opinion of the hon. member.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: The question of a referendum was so serious and complicated that it would require to be considered carefully by both Houses and at every stage, and proper provisions and safeguards would have to be embodied. If we carried the amendment, probably any Ministry of the day which wished to take revenge upon an opponent or upon the Opposition, or to make its will felt, could appeal to a majority in another place and carry a referendum probably entirely against the wishes of the Legislative Council. Then the Ministry would say that the direction of the people must be followed out to its logical issue.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The fate of this new clause as it were hinged upon this amendment. Dr. Hackett, he understood, was delegated to hasten slowly in the matter of altering the Constitution. Was it not better to take this concession, that any referendum raising Constitutional points should only be made by Act of Parliament, rather than endanger this clause. To pass this clause with the addition which he (the Minister) wished to place in it would be a distinct gain to the position in which we now found ourselves. The suggestion in no way affected the future operation of the clause the hon. member was anxious to have in the Bill.

Amendment negatived; the clause passed, and added to the Bill.

Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments, and the report adopted.

ELECTORAL BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

Amendments recommended by a select committee in this Bill were now con-

sidered in Committee of the whole House, as in the previous Bill.

Clauses 1 to 13—agreed to.

On motion by **HON. J. W. HACKETT**,
Clauses 14 to 21 struck out.

Clause 22—Preparation of Rolls:

On motion by **HON. J. W. HACKETT**,
clause struck out, and the following inserted in lieu:—

Electoral rolls shall be prepared and kept under the direction of chief electoral officer, by the registrar of each division of a province and of each district.

Clauses 23 to 32—agreed to.

Clause 33—How made up:

On motion by **HON. J. W. HACKETT**,
the words "the municipal and road board rate books" struck out of line 2, and the words "the lists of municipal and road board electors, made out pursuant to Section thirty-nine" inserted after "Commonwealth rolls," in line 2.

Clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 34—agreed to.

Clause 35—Names of Council electors to be registered on one roll only:

On motion by the **HON. J. W. HACKETT**, clause struck out and the following inserted in lieu:—

Notice in the form C in the Second Schedule shall be given by the inspector of parliamentary rolls to every selector whose name appears on two or more divisions of the roll of any province, requiring the elector to choose the division for which he is to be registered. 2, In default of a choice being made by the elector and communicated to the inspector of parliamentary rolls within the time stated in the notice, the inspector of parliamentary rolls shall strike out the name of the elector from every division of the roll except one, to be stated in the notice.

Clause 36—Additions of new names:

On motion by **HON. J. W. HACKETT**,
the following added as Subclause 2:—

The list of municipal and road board electors transmitted to the registrar in accordance with Section 39.

Clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 37, 38—agreed to.

Clause 39—Right to transfer:

On motion by **HON. J. W. HACKETT**,
the words "province or in another" struck out of line 3.

Clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 40 to 46—agreed to.

Clause 47—Revision Courts:

On motion by HON. J. W. HACKETT, the following added to the clause :—

And notice thereof shall be given by the clerk of the court seven days at least before the holdings thereof by advertisement in a newspaper circulating in the district.

Clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 48 to 52—agreed to.

Clause 53—When Court not duly constituted; Notice of adjournment :

On motion by HON. J. W. HACKETT, the words "or some other effective way," in lines 2 and 3 of Subclause 2, struck out, and "circulating in the district" inserted in lieu.

Clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 54 to 57—agreed to.

Clause 58—List to be published :

HON. J. W. HACKETT moved that the words "or adjourned sitting of the Court," in lines 1 and 2, be struck out.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY : The Crown Solicitor and Attorney General stated that it would be well to allow the words to remain. Members of the select committee thought that these words would clash with a previous clause. Clause 58 provided apparently that 10 days' notice should be given of a sitting or an adjourned sitting, but that was not so in reality. As long as the 10 days' notice of the sitting was given it was not necessary to give any farther notice of an adjournment, and both the Attorney General and the Crown Solicitor now thought it would be well to leave the words in, and when the clause was read carefully it was apparent that the two clauses did not clash. If the clause read "and any adjourned sitting" it would be altogether different.

Amendment withdrawn, and the clause passed.

Clauses 59 to 104—agreed to.

Clause 105—Ballot papers :

HON. J. W. HACKETT moved :

That Subclause 3 be struck out.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY : It was to be hoped the Committee would not support the amendment. The Government were desirous of seeing a uniform system of voting for Parliament, whether in the case of the Federal Parliament or the State Parliament. Presumably with municipal elections either the Federal or State House of Parliament had little to do. There would be a Federal election on or about the 16th December, and the

electors of Western Australia would be asked to vote by placing crosses in the squares opposite the names of the candidates for whom they wished to vote. The system had existed in England for many years and had worked satisfactorily; it had also worked satisfactorily in South Australia for a great number of years, and the Federal Parliament had decided to adopt this system. One could have wished the Federal Parliament had adopted the system of striking out the names of the candidates for whom the voters did not wish to vote; but as they had not done so and they had been first in the field, it would be a great pity to spoil the uniformity of voting in this State by objecting to the system of voting which was almost as good as ours. Moreover, this measure was fairly liberal, because any informality arising through voters reverting to the old practice of striking out names would not render their votes informal.

HON. J. W. HACKETT : This matter was carefully and fully considered by the select committee, who were unanimously of opinion that it was desirable to maintain the system with which the State was thoroughly acquainted, and which had existed for so many years. There must be some difference between the voting at municipal elections and that at Parliamentary elections, and one would vote three times at least as often, and perhaps oftener, at municipal elections as at Parliamentary elections. Some persons who voted were, to a certain degree, nervous or excited, and one might put a cross on the wrong side or place it between the names of two candidates, so that one could not distinguish for whom it was intended. We ought to have either the one system or the other, and he was entirely with the select committee. The cross system would not have been adopted by the Federal Parliament but for the fact that it was made a Government measure by a dominating influence; otherwise the Federal Parliament would, it was almost certain, have retained the old system.

HON. G. RANDELL : The Committee would, he hoped, support the select committee on this question. From his remembrance of public matters when the cross system was in existence he felt pretty sure the informal spoilt votes were

much more numerous than under the present system. The striking out of the name seemed the simplest way of voting. There was, however, some little force in what the leader of the House had said with regard to the Federal Parliament having adopted this cross system. That point did not weigh with him. In fact he would be inclined to go in the opposite direction to that adopted by the Federal Parliament, because we had little to thank the Federal Government for. He supported the old system because under it people would be less liable to make mistakes. The safeguards referred to by the Colonial Secretary barely bore out that hon. gentleman's construction, for they did not afford the protection claimed for them.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY : So long as the names of the candidates for whom the elector did not wish to vote were struck out, it did not invalidate the ballot paper.

HON. G. RANDELL : The old system would lead to fewer papers being rejected through informality. The principle had been in force for years, and was used in municipal and roads board elections, and even in church elections.

HON. W. MALEY : If a man was so nervous as not to be able to put a cross within a square, or if a man was powerless through fear or through a word that rhymed with fear, the country was much better without his vote. With our present educational institutions there was every reason to believe there would be few informal votes. In South Australia the square and cross system was a great success, and had been adopted by the Commonwealth Parliament.

HON. J. W. HACKETT : What was the advantage?

HON. W. MALEY : It was certainly rude to put a pencil through a friend's name.

HON. J. A. THOMSON supported the subclause as printed, not because the system of affixing a cross opposite the name of a candidate was the most effective method of voting, but because the Commonwealth Parliament had decided to have the cross system. At the last election for senators people were confused at having to strike out the names of 10 candidates, and most of the informal votes were caused by electors affixing

ticks or crosses opposite the names of candidates they favoured. Most of these informal votes came from the cities.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY : We should be actuated in Western Australia by the desire to get a uniform system of voting. Two systems of voting were within Parliamentary control, the municipal and the Parliamentary systems. The Federal system was quite out of our control. The wisest thing would be to conform all our voting systems to the Federal system. We should adopt the system which was a success in South Australia and in England. Anybody who was too excited to hit the right square would be too excited to hit the right name.

HON. J. W. HACKETT : We should adopt the system that provided the least possibility of error, for people were apt to be confused at elections. We should allow the old system to remain for some years until we saw what system was finally adopted by the Federal Parliament. There was every possibility there might be a change in the Federal system. Several Eastern States showed no sign of changing from the old system. The balance of advantage appeared to be on the side of the select committee's recommendation.

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

Ayes	17
Noes	5

Majority for 12

AYES.	NOES.
Hon. G. Bellingham	Hon. W. Kingsmill
Hon. T. F. O. Brimage	Hon. R. Laurie
Hon. J. D. Conolly	Hon. W. Mailey
Hon. A. Dempster	Hon. B. C. O'Brien
Hon. C. E. Dempster	Hon. J. A. Thomson
Hon. J. M. Drew	(Teller).
Hon. J. W. Hackett	
Hon. S. J. Haynes	
Hon. A. G. Jenkins	
Hon. Z. Lane	
Hon. W. T. Loton	
Hon. C. A. Piesse	
Hon. G. Randell	
Hon. Sir George Shenton	
Hon. C. Sommers	
Hon. J. W. Wright	
Hon. E. McLarty (Teller).	

Amendment thus passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Progress reported, and leave given to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 9:49 o'clock, until the next day.